CHURCH HISTORY



Published by

THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF CHURCH HISTORY

THE AMERICAN COMERCY OF CHURCH HISTORY

Property of the Editorial

HAROSE & BESTER

G. HAROSE & BESTER

UNEL C. RICHARDSON

EDWARD G. SCHARDSON

MARHAME M. KEARSEN

A LID OF CHURCH HISTOR

Laker Housing Pater

Line History

Line History

Line History

CHURCH HISTORY

EDITORIAL BOARD

MATTHEW SPINKA, Managing Editor ROBERT HASTINGS NICHOLS PERCY V. NORWOOD, ex officio

Vol. XIII	September, 1944	No.3

Contents of previous issues of CHURCH HISTORY may be found by consulting the International Index to Periodicals in your library.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Friedrich Nietzsche (1844-1900)	
Karl Löwith	163
THE HISTORIOGRAPHY OF THE MENNONITES IN THE NETHERLANDS; A GUIDE TO SOURCES Cornelius Krahn	182
CHURCH AND STATE IN PROTESTANT GERMANY BEFORE	
1918: WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO PRUSSIA	
Andrew Landale Drummond	210
Book Reviews	230
QUESTEN JOHANNES AND KUTTNER, STEPHAN, eds.: Tradi- tio, Vol.I	Cap.
Boyd, Catherine E.: A Cistercian Nunnery in Mediaeval Italy	Сар.

CONTENTS

Adams, Henry Hitch, English Domestic or Homiletic Tragedy, 1575-1642
Batten, J. Minton: John Dury: Advocate of Christian Re- union Winthrop S. Hudson
HUTCHESON, HAROLD R., ed. and tr.: Lord Herbert of Cherbury's De Religione Laici
Sencourt, Robert: Carmelite and Poet, a Framed Portrait of St. John of the Cross E. R. Hardy, Jr.
BLIED, BENJAMIN J.: Austrian Aid to American Catholics, 1830-1860 Conrad Henry Moehlman
LOWRIE, WALTER: A Short Life of Kierkegaard Wilhelm Pauck
MULLER, JAMES ARTHUR: The Episcopal Theological School, 1867-1943
Henney, Bertal: Leaders of the Canadian Church, 3rd series
Cadden, John Paul: The Historiography of the American Catholic Church, 1785-1943
Bratton, Fred G.: The Legacy of the Liberal Spirit Robert Hastings Nichols

216. Banka Helds.

FRIEDRICH NIETZSCHE (1844-1900)

KARL LÖWITH
Hartford Theological Seminary, Hartford, Conn.

To commemorate Nietzsche on the occasion of his hundredth anniversary is both easy and difficult. It is easy because one cannot but remember him as the prophet of our century. He is more alive in 1944 than he was in 1888 when he suddenly burned out like a volcano after the last eruption, called *Ecce Homo*. He knew every recess of the modern soul, its widest periphery and its hidden center. His problems are our problems and his predicament is our own. For this very reason it is also difficult to commemorate him. He is still becoming what he is, and one cannot but hesitate to sum up his final significance in the history of Western man and the Christian Occident.

T

Nietzsche's various influences are so great and still growing that one can hardly discriminate between his influence and his thought. It seems as if his work were almost absorbed by its influence upon many different men and movements of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. He impressed, first of all, one of his most congenial followers, Gabriele d' Annunzio, and through him many an Italian youth.1 In France he evoked the profound sympathy of André Gide,² and in Germany he became to the followers of Stefan George,3 the supreme judge of the nineteenth century. He gave the basic inspiration to men like R. Pannwitz, Oswald Spengler, Thomas Mann, who said in a commemoration of 1924 that whoever believes in a European future swears by the name of Nietzsche. He determined the thought of L. Klages, A. Baeumler, and E. Jünger, and he became, last but not least, the supreme authority of that German youth which is now fighting all over Europe. To Nietzsche we owe more than to anyone else that change in the intellectual climate and the very feeling which followed the end of the "fin de siècle."

(Breslau, 1924).

¹ See G. d'Annunzio's poem "Per la Morte di un Distruttore."

² See A. Gide's letter to Angèle in Jahrbuch der Nietzsche-Gesellschaft, 1925.
3 E. Bertram, Nietzsche, (Berlin, 1918); and K. Hildebrandt, Wagner and Nietzsche,

There are few Europeans who are not—consciously or unconsciously, by attraction or repulsion—post-Nietzschean in their way of feeling and thinking. That is true at least for the Germans, French, and Italians.

He had a remarkably small and sporadic influence in England and America. His passionate radicalism and superstyle probably could not appeal to the temper, the common sense, and the political wisdom of the English race. I know only one very fascinating exception, T. E. Lawrence, whose passionate soul was as ambitious and ascetic, ruthless and scrupulous. austere and refined, triumphant and desperate, as that of Nietzsche. Among the choice books which Lawrence kept at his cottage were Nietzsche's The Joyful Wisdom, The Twilight of the Idols. The Antichrist and Zarathustra. In his letters he refers several times to Zarathustra, The Brothers Karamasov, Moby Dick, War and Peace, and Don Quixote as "the five titanic books" to which The Seven Pillars of Wisdom should add one more. Apart from such an exceptional man as Lawrence. the English mind had no affinity to Nietzsche, and therefore little understanding of the intellectual background which prepared Germany for its desperate stroke.

At this point it is inevitable to enter into the intricate question of Nietzsche's political responsibility. "Responsibility" has always two sides: the responsibility of those who challenge and intend something, and the responsibility of those who Between the intellectual challenge of the former and respond. the political response of the latter, there is no simple correspondence or equation. Usually it is, however, the secondary response to, and the practical application of, an original thought which is reflected upon the latter, making it subsequently responsible for the response, though its real effectiveness is due to its intellectual power of anticipation. Men of insight and vision realize the real issues long before they become realities, and if once the realm of spirit is revolutionized, even reality cannot The great revolutionary thinkers were all far ahead of their time, thereby "unseitgemäss" in their own time, and relevant for future generations. They created the intellectual climate in which alone certain things became possible.4

⁴ Carl Mayer's article "On the intellectual origin of National Socialism," Social Research (May, 1942): and the recent discussion of L. Spitzer and A. Lovejoy on "Geistesgeschichte vs. History of Ideas as Applied to Hitlerism," Journal of the History of Ideas (April, 1944).

Nietzsche created what one might call Nietzscheanism, i. e., a most radical form of German "Protestantism." I see no reason to deny to Nietzsche's ideas their historic effectiveness and insofar also their political responsibility. It is the privilege of great individuals to become guilty in history.

But even if we grant that Nietzsche's philosophical ideas —concerning Christianity and democracy, morals and politics prepared the way for the European upheaval, is he also responsible for the ideology of the Nazis? Professor Crane Brinton⁵ has tried to answer this question by confronting the official Nietzsche-interpretations of Nazi-writers with Nietzsche himself. The unsatisfactory result of his study is that a great deal of Nietzsche's thinking fits perfectly well into the ideology of the Nazis, and a great deal does not fit at all. Brinton evades a decision whether the former or the latter half of Nietzsche, or neither of them, is the real one by saying that if there really was a true Nietzsche, he is gone, and what lives after him are only many different selective interpretations by "gentle" and "tough" Nietzscheans. I do not think that Brinton's brilliant common sense affords any insight into the problem of Nietzsche's historic significance. He underestimates not only Nietzsche, who is to him no more than an ambitious German professor who went beyond good and evil but not beyond Mussolini and Hitler. but also the Nazis. For who are the "Nazis" for whose ideology Nietzsche is supposed to be largely responsible? And what is the connecting link between Nietzsche and the Nazis? To answer this question I propose to neglect for a moment the artificial distinction between one abstraction called Nietzsche and another called Nazis, and to realize the simple but fundamental fact that both are Germans! I do not believe in the fashionable discrimination between two Germanies, the one from Frederick the Great to Bismarck and Hitler, and the other from Goethe to Nietzsche and Thomas Mann. This distinction forgets that Goethe had much admiration for Frederick. Nietzsche for Goethe and Frederick, and Thomas Mann for Frederick, Goethe. and Nietzsche alike. Only wishful thinking believes in the "other Germany" and not in the authentic one. There are everywhere conflicts and oppositions within the same nation, but there is no other Germany, just as there is no other France. though she is divided. The best that is in every country is of

⁵ Crane Brinton, Nietzche (Cambridge, Mass., 1941), 200ff.

that country as the worst is. Germany has produced Luther as well as Dürer, Frederick as well as Lessing, Bismarck as well as Nietzsche, Hitler as well as Heidegger. What is peculiar, however, to German philosophy from Kant to Nietzsche is its radicalism, the courage to dig remorselessly for the roots of things and to draw the ultimate conclusions. Nobody realized better than Nietzsche himself that it was the "magic of the extreme" which was fighting for him. "We do not need any allies, not even lies, for we seduce by the mere force of being extreme." Ruthlessness of intellect can be admirable and even most moral, while ruthlessness of character and action is detestable. Both are, however, peculiar to the Germans, for they are radical even in the practical application of abstract principles. And that is the point where Nietzsche and the Germans came to agree with each other. The transition, however, from Nietzsche's philosophical design to its political application, which necessarily implies distortion and simplification, was neither in the hands of the designer nor in that of the builders. process is effected by history which always embraces both: thinkers as well as actors, promoters as well as opponents, conformists as well as objectors, all together responsible for what they intended, and not responsible for what they achieved, for the ways by which ideas as well as actions become historically effective are unpredictable and beyond our intentions. Granted that Nietzsche prepared the way for the German revolution, one must also grant him that all path-makers prepared the way for others, just because they did not walk that way themselves.

The endeavor to discharge Nietzsche from the guilt of his historic effectiveness is as futile as the opposite attempt to charge him with direct responsibility. The former is done by those "gentle" Nietzscheans who liked him before 1933 without realizing, however, his deepest implications, and who are now unwilling to risk disappointment by re-examining their old loyalty. The latter is done by those who discovered in the German revolution the dynamite of Nietzsche's writings, but who do not understand that history achieves always more and less than what has been intended by its prophets. Thus Rousseau prepared the way for the French Revolution, just as Nietzsche prepared the German counter-revolution against the ideals of the first. Neither of them would recognize his ideas in Robespierre and Himmler, respectively. It is true that Nietzsche interpreted

the "will to truth" as a "will to power," but he also warned his readers that the *Will to Power* is a book "exclusively for thinking." The Germans, he adds, have however unlearned to think, being now so much impressed by their military and industrial achievements; only as a political principle would the will to power be intelligible to them.

In his reflections concerning the twentieth century, Nietzsche quotes from Galiani the following passage: "La prévoyance est la cause des guerres actuelles de l'Europe. Si l'on voulait se donner la peine de ne rien prévoir, tout le monde serait tranquille." Upon this Nietzsche comments: "As I in no way share the unwarlike views of my friend Galiani, I have no fear whatever of foretelling something, and thereby possibly causing in some way future wars." What did Nietzsche foretell and thereby suggest as a possibility? No more and no less than our world-war revolution. A few quotations may show the crescendo of Nietzsche's understanding of Europe's condition and of his own task in regard to it.

In 1874 he described the situation thus: the decay of all contemplation and simplicity, the increasing hurry of life, accelerate the complete uprooting of all culture. The waters of religion are ebbing and dirty swamps are left behind. All possibilities of a Christian life are now tried out, the most costly as well as the cheapest ones. Even mockery, cynicism, and hostility toward Christianity have been played out to the end. It seems as if it were time to invent something new, but it will be difficult to find the way out. The sciences blindly drive along on a laissez-faire system without a common standard. They are splitting up and losing hold of every firm principle. cated classes are swept along in the contemptible struggle for wealth. Never was the world more worldly, never poorer in love. Everything bows before the coming barbarism, art and science included. There is certainly enormous strength, but it is wild and merciless. For a century, i. e., since the French Revolution, we have been ready for a world-shaking convulsion. and though we have lately been trying to set the strength of the "National State" against the great modern tendency toward volcanic destruction, this modern state itself will for a long time remain an aggravation of the universal unrest. Nowadays affairs are directed by fools and knaves—the selfishness of the

⁶ Werke (Oktav-Ausgabe) XIV, 420.

money-makers and the brute force of the militarists. In their hands the state makes a good show of reorganizing everything and of becoming the only bond that unites the warring elements. We shall come to feel the consequences.

About ten years later Nietzsche had made up his mind as to the inevitability of the European catastrophe which he neither wished to promote nor to prevent, but to make transparent in its deeper significance by analyzing its antecedents and its potentialities. In the last chapter of Ecce Homo ("Why I am a Fatality"), we read: "There will come a day when my name will recall the memory of something formidable, a crisis the like of which has never been known on earth, the memory of the most profound clash of consciences, and the passing of a sentence upon all that which theretofore had been believed. . . . Shocks are bound to ensue and a spell of earthquakes, followed by the transposition of hills and valleys, such as the world has never yet imagined even in its dreams. The concept 'politics' then becomes elevated to the sphere of spiritual warfare. All the mighty realms of the ancient order of society are blown into space.... There will be wars the like of which have never been seen on earth before. Only from my time and after me will politics on a large scale exist on earth."

Similarly, he describes the history of the twentieth century in the preface to The Will to Power as the "triumph of Nihilism" which is the "logic of decadence." Out of it comes, however, a new order of life. Its political aspect is the unification of Europe and its mastery over the globe. In order to force Europe into this "long-range policy," Europe must overcome its nihilism by forming again a decisive and purposeful whole, beating out a new order of life. Nihilism, this infirmity of the will, is at its worst where civilization has longest prevailed, as in France. It decreases where the barbarian still or again asserts his claims under the drapery of Western civilization, as in Russia and Germany. The more threatening the attitude of Russia becomes, the more will Europe have to become equally threatening by acquiring one will by means of a ruling caste that can set its aims thousands of years ahead and drill the democratic masses for its purpose. The time of petty-states is over. The twentieth century, Nietzsche prophesied, will bring the compulsion to great imperialistic politics for the dominion of the globe.

⁷ Thoughts Out of Season, III, paragraph 4; and Werke, X, 289.

this end, Germany will have to strive for an "agreement" with England, "for nobody believes any longer that England will be strong enough to keep playing her old role even for fifty years more." Nowadays one must be a soldier first lest one loses one's credit as a merchant. The next century will be seen following in the footsteps of Napoleon, the most anticipating personality of modern times. The standing armies, permanent since the Napoleonic wars, are but the first sign of Europe's new military development. Personal, virile, and physical capacity recovers its value, valuations become more physical. Beautiful men have once more become possible, bloodless snakes are a matter of the past. The savage in everyone of us is acknowledged. A master-race can grow up from terrible and violent beginnings only. The problem is: "where are the barbarians of the twentieth century?" It will be those elements which are capable of the longest and strongest will.8 Nietzsche's faith in the future of Europe lies in its increasing virility. The first step toward this movement we owe to Napoleon who first wanted Europe to be one and mistress of the globe. Having entered into "the classical age of war," which will be at the same time scientific and popular, we shall need many brave pioneers They must be silent, solitary, and resolute men, content and persistent in invisible activity, accustomed to command with perfect assurance, and equally ready to obey, men more imperilled, productive and happy, for the secret of realizing the greatest enjoyment of existence is to live in danger. That is why Nietzsche is dangerous.

H

This political program is not at the periphery of Nietzsche's philosophy but rooted in its center. But what is his philosophy? Is it really only a conglomerate of arbitrary selections of Nietzsche? Taken apart from their context one can find in Nietzsche's thousands of aphorisms whatever one wishes: passages, e.g., on racediscipline and marriage which could make him a leader of Nazi education; and other passages on the Reich of Bismarck and the character of the Germans, which would make him disappear in a concentration camp. Often these apparent contradictions

⁸ The Will to Power, paragraph 900ff, 1053ff, 127f; Beyond Good and Evil, paragraph 208; Werke, XIII, 358; XI, 373ff.
9 The Joyful Wisdom, paragraph 362 and 283.

can be explained by considering their polemic implications, but sometimes they cannot be reconciled. Studied as a whole it is. however, evident that Nietzsche's thought, despite its bewildering richness, is almost monotonous, like every philosophic system which originates from one basic experience and drives at one definite aim. Nietzsche's basic experience was the devaluation of all our values, his aim was the "transvaluation of all values" which is the subtitle of The Will to Power. The devaluation originates in the last analysis from the death of God, the transvaluation aims at the restoration of the classic values, symbolized in the pagan god Dionysos. Between the death of the Christian God and the rebirth of Dionysos, Europe is in the state of nihilism, i. e., of social and political, moral and spiritual dissolution, where "nothing is true and everything is allowed." This nihilism has two phases: it is at first a nihilism of weakness, of weariness and morbidity (called "pessimism"), and is now to develop into a resolute nihilism of strength which prefers "to will nothingness to not be willing at all." Hence the whole system of Nietzsche's thought can be summed up in the three basic concepts: the death of God, nihilism, will to power. Since I may assume that everyone of us has a certain experience of what Nietzsche called nihilism, 10 I will explain only the first and the third concept.

It is characteristic of Nietzsche that he dealt with the death of God first in his Joyful Wisdom, though he realized the frightful implications of this event more than anyone else. "The most important of more recent events—that 'God is dead,' begins to cast its first shadows over Europe." Some old profound confidence seems to have changed into doubt. In the main, however, the event itself is far too great and too remote as to have already reached most people's power of apprehension. Only a few realize what really had taken place, and what must all collapse now that this belief had been undermined, because so much was built upon it and rested upon it—"for example, our entire European morality." Nietzsche understood what has been forgotten since Kant's reduction of religion to the limits of reason, that

¹⁰ A typical illustration of "Nihilism" in its irresolute form of weakness is the following passage from *The Education of Henry Adams*: "He very gravely doubted, from his aching consciousness of religious void, whether any large fraction of society cared for a future life, or even for the present one, thirty years hence. . . For the old world of public men and measures since 1870 Adams wept no tears, he never saw anything to admire in it, or anything he wanted to save. Not an act, or an expression, or an image showed depth of faith and hope."

the Jewish Christian religion is not only an essentially moral religion, but also a religion the morality of which rests on a faith, which is now dead. Though the consequences of this event are more than gloomy, Nietzsche relates it in his *Joyful Wisdom* because "at last the horizon seems open once more." The sea again lies open before those who like danger and risk."

The death of God by which life loses its traditional ballast and standard of evaluation means that we have to replace the faith in a purposeful will of God by our own will. The decay of our traditional values motivates the will to new values, to a new standard of evaluation. Thus the will to power is the "countermovement" to the devaluation of our values, a process which ultimately derives from the death of the Christian God. This new will to power is a "self-conquest" of nihilism, for it cannot come except out of it. Zarathustra is "the victor over God and Nothingness," i. e., the absence of aim or purpose consequent upon the death of God. The will of man, emancipated from any transcendent "Thou shalt," must learn to command itself. For this a superlative energy and discipline is required: a will to power.

The will to power is in Nietzsche's philosophy an ontological and therefore universal term interpreting the nature of every being. 13 It is not to be confined to the conscious individual will or to "power-politics" (if there is any other kind of politics) but it also does not exclude force and violence. The will to power covers the power of organic assimilation, of physical strength, vital energy, social ascendancy, and political mastery, as well as the power of moral strength, spiritual energy, and ascetic discipline. And since all kinds of external power over something, the capability of over-powering, are conditioned by intrinsic power, the most important power is self-mastery: the power to overcome oneself. The will to power manifests itself in overcoming resistances. Its general structure is everywhere the same: from the power of appropriating and assimilating in the protoplasm to the power of conquering and transforming a foreign country. The will to power is at the bottom of violence against others and of self-sacrifice, of hate and love,

11 The Joyful Wisdom, paragraph 343 and 125.

13 G. A. Morgan, What Nietzsche Means (Cambridge, Mass., 1941), 119ff.

¹² See Zarathustra's first speech on "The Three Metamorphoses," i. e., from the Christian "Thou shalt" of The Camel, to the modern "I will" of the Lion, to the classic "I am" of the Child which has regained the innocence of cosmic being.

of revenge and charity. It is the basic character of "life" in its fullness, living in the tension between growth and decay, good and evil, truth and illusion. Life as will to power is creative by being also destructive—beyond the moral separation of good and evil, of war and peace. If we subtract, says Nietzsche, from the notion of God supreme goodness and wisdom, he still is supreme power, and that is enough, for from it follows everything: the basic character of the whole living world. Man is distinguished from this character of all nature not by nature but only by being conscious of it.

Nietzsche calls this world of will to power a "Dionysian world" of eternal self-creation and self-destruction. He describes it in terms similar to those which Goethe used in his Fragment on *Nature*, and Schelling in his *Ages of the World*; it is a monster of finite energy without beginning and end, a sea of forces storming and raging in itself, forever changing and yet always the same, rolling back over incalculable ages to recurrences, producing the most complicated and contradictory forms out of the most simple structure, and then returning from multifariousness to uniformity, from the play of contradictions back into the delight of consonance, saying Yea unto itself, "and even ye yourselves are this will to power and nothing besides." Man and his history are included in this cyclic world of eternal recurrences without aim, "unless there is an aim in the bliss of the circle—without will, unless a ring must by nature keep good will to itself."14

This world of the eternal recurrence of generation and corruption is in each of its manifestations equally powerful and equally valuable. It is not a created but an eternal world and as such as decidedly antichristian as the cyclic theory of the pagan philosophers whom the Fathers of the Church (Justin, Origen, Irenaeus, Augustine) tried to refute as incompatible with God's creation and with his unique revelation in Christ. The whole meaning of Nietzsche's philosophy is indeed expressed in the last sentence of *Ecce Homo*: "Dionysos against Christ." When Nietzsche had finished *Ecce Homo*, he signed the manuscript: "Given on the first day of the year one (September 30, 1888, of the false chronology)."

How deep-rooted in Nietzsche's thinking this final perspec-14 The Will to Power, paragraph 1067. tive was may be seen from the fact that the alternative, either the Christian God or the Dionysian World, appears already in an autobiographical sketch of 1863 when Nietzsche was nineteen years old. It begins with the statement: "As a plant I am born near the churchyard (Gottesacker), as a man in a pastorate," and it ends with the question: "Thus man is outgrowing everything which once embraced him. But where is the Ring which at last will comprehend him? Is it the World? Is it God?" The introductory sentence is revealing, for Nietzsche's philosophy is indeed a Protestant event, like the whole German philosophy from Kant to Hegel and from Hegel to Nietzsche. Nobody knew this better than Nietzsche himself who wrote: "The Lutheran pastor is the grandfather of German philosophy." its peccatum originale is Protestantism." The last sentence is no less revealing, for it shows how early Nietzsche felt the necessity of a decision between the Christian God and the ring of the cyclic world, between creation and eternal recurrence. Twenty years later, in Zarathustra, he had definitely decided that it is the world as a will to power which redeems our contingent existence, this casual *Ecce homo*, by re-integrating it again into the cosmos. The Christian ego which "since Copernicus fell from the center toward an X," becomes again an integral part of the cosmos the God of which is Dionysos. Thus Nietzsche's final decision renews no more and no less than the secular decision between Christianity and paganism, and that "transvaluation" of all values which the founders of the Church had effected against the ancient world.

III

But when Nietzsche went mad, he signed some of his letters "Dionysos the Crucified," confusing himself with the dismembered Dionysos Zagreus and with the crucified Christ. This double signature reveals not only an accidental confusion but an ultimate problem, the problem of Nietzsche's anti-christian Christianity. The first and even lasting impression which the reader of Nietzsche must have, is of course the decidedly anti-christian character of his philosophy. There cannot be the least doubt about the deadly sincerity of Nietzsche's most radical rejection of either the New Testament or of the most diluted form of social gospel. All attempts which have been made by liberal Protestants to use Nietzsche as a kind of tonic

can be explained only by intellectual blindness or by very poor judgment. F. Overbeck knew better when he said that it is the most pathetic judgment upon modern Christianity that no great man can stand up against Christianity without being claimed as a defender of it. A truly Christian interpretation of Nietzsche cannot but come to the conclusion of Vladimir Solovev: that Nietzsche was as alien to the faith in Christ as to that in the real Antichrist.¹⁵

And yet this tells only half the story of Nietzsche's position against and within Christianity. It is not by chance that time and again attempts have been made by Christians to vindicate Nietzsche from the viewpoint of his potential Christianity, and the interesting point is that the more recent attempts of this kind are more consistent and persuasive than those by nineteenth century liberals.16 There is not a little that can be said in favor of their thesis. First of all: Nietzsche was by his sheer passion for and concern with an *ultimate* truth, by which to live, more religious than most contemporary Christians. Even his scepsis has the ardor of faith. Concerned with the first and the last things he was more eschatological than the professional theologians who had quite forgotten that Christianity deals with an eschaton, and he was himself very conscious of his religious temper. "I have lived on purpose the whole contradiction of a religious nature. I know the devil's perspective for God." Thus one can compare him with men like Pascal, Kierkegaard, Dostoevsky, but not with the theists and atheists of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. He was far away from the wit and the lucidity of Voltaire, from the shallowness of David Strauss' "new belief" in Darwin and civilization, and from the complacent atheism of Feuerbach who negated only the divine subject but kept all its predicates, like goodness, love, and justice. Nietzsche alone was a radical atheist who questioned the very value of our traditional values, the morality of our morals. In him alone the great suspicion arose whether such values as goodness, unselfishness, love, justice, peace, and happiness—in short all that constitutes our Christian humanity, are ultimate values at all. As a radical atheist he is a turning point in the his-

15 Die geistigen Grundlagen des Lebens (Jena, 1914), 167ff.

¹⁵ Die geistigen Grundlagen des Lebens (Jena, 1914), 167H.
16 E. Benz, "Nietzsches Ideen zur Geschichte des Christentums," Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte (1937, Heft 2 and 3); J. Schor, Deutschland auf dem Wege nach Damaskus (Luzern, 1934); Urs von Balthasar, Die Apokalypse der Deutschen Seele (München, 1937), II.

tory of modern atheism. He longed for a new faith—from the early poem "To the unknown God" to the late Ariadne poem where he invokes again his unknown God as his "hangman and final happiness." God, he says, was suffocated by theology, but he will reappear as a living power, transfigured as Dionysos. Even the will to power, he says, is still a "theodicy," for though the philosophy of life and power does not need any justification of evil, it ends nevertheless with an unconditional Yea to this world as the most perfect being.

The only way to perfection is, however, through resistance and suffering—suffering not so much by passive endurance as by active conquest. The two great types of sufferers are the classic hero and the Christian saint, and it was Nietzsche's peculiar ambition to unite both in his ideal of a heroic self-sacrifice. Thus he discriminates between Dionysos and Christ not on account of their suffering, but in regard to the different meaning of it: whether a Christian or a tragic meaning be given to it. "In the first case suffering is the road to a holy mode of existence; in the second case existence itself is regarded as sufficiently holy to justify an enormous amount of suffering . . . God on the Cross is a curse upon Life . . .; Dionysos cut into pieces is a promise of Life: it will be forever born anew, and rise afresh from destruction."

But when Nietzsche describes the type of followers he wanted to have, it is exactly the type of Christians: they should be experienced in suffering, abandonment, sickness, and degradation: they should know profound self-mistrust and have tasted defeat, for only these things could prove today the worth of a man. This statement seems strangely inconsistent with Nietzsche's apology of the classic virtues of pride and self-confidence, physical beauty and strength. It is, however, not so utterly inconsistent if we consider that the worth of humility is in direct proportion to potential pride, for nobody can surrender his will who does not have a will to self-assertion.

The same ambiguity as in Nietzsche's religious temper constitutes the very heart of his moral philosophy. Nietzsche's "Immoralism" is, to use his own words, the mature fruit of "2000 years of moral discipline and self-crucifixion in examining our conscience." What has really gained the victory over

¹⁷ The Will to Power, paragraph 1052.

the Christian God is "Christian morality itself, the conception of veracity, taken ever more strictly, the confessional subtlety of the Christian conscience, translated and sublimated to . . . intellectual purity at any price. To look upon Nature as if it were a proof of the goodness and care of a God; to interpret History . . . as a constant testimony to a moral order in the world and a moral final purpose; to explain personal experiences . . . as if everything were a dispensation or intimation of providence ... all that is now past, it has conscience against it.... By virtue of this severity, if by anything, we are good Europeans."18 Thus it is the Christian morality itself which motivates Nietzsche's immoralism, and even in this respect he could refer to Christ himself who went beyond the good and evil of established Iewish morality. Nietzsche's immoralism rests again on a faith, not in God, but in nature, substituting cosmology for theology.

Beyond this inherent ambiguity of Nietzsche's religious temper and moral passion there are passages in his writings which suggest a single-minded recognition of the Christian ideal. His well-known sentence that "There has been only one Christian, and he died on the Cross" can easily be supplemented by similar statements, e. g.: "Christ on the Cross is still the most sublime symbol." The most striking passage is one in the Anti-Christ, an interpretation of Christ which separates him from all historic-dogmatic Christianity (according to Nietzsche an invention of St. Paul), characterizing him with obvious sympathy as a perfect soul the life of which was light and personal truth. Not having been concerned at all with social, political, and cultural interests, he also did not feel the slightest opposition to the "world" in the sense of the later Church. He knew himself as one with his heavenly Father, so he also did not know what sin Though Nietzsche's picture of Jesus is not entirely sympathetic, but colored by the same criticism which he applied to certain Christian types of Dostoevsky, it remains nevertheless a stumbling block to every straightforward interpretation of Nietzsche as an Antichrist.

All this together may suggest an interpretation of Nietzsche's Antichristian Christianity with the emphasis on the second word. The most affirmative of these interpretations is that of a Jesuit, Urs von Balthasar. He does not hesitate to

¹⁸ The Joyful Wisdom, paragraph 357.

assert that Nietzsche defends Christianity even better than Dostoevsky, and that he penetrates the very secret of Christianity more than anyone else in the nineteenth century, by recognizing the secret of self-sacrifice. Balthasar holds that the anti-christian position of Nietzsche is, to quote from a letter of Nietzsche himself, only the "popular aspect," while Nietzsche's own passion (in the double sense of this word) is the first and the last fact of his life. Nietzsche realized, as Balthasar says, "faith as an absolute experiment of his own existence."

I would not go so far as Balthasar, and this for two reasons. First, the "existential" definition of faith as the absolute experiment of one's own existence does not imply any commitment to a definite object of faith, to a faith in Christ. Second, the idea of a vicarious self-sacrifice as such, without qualification, is not specifically Christian. It is common to many non-christian religions. Taken, however, in its Christian meaning, it is incompatible with Nietzsche's idea of sacrifice. For one of his arguments against Christianity is just that it increased so much the value of each individual in his relation to God as to make it impossible to sacrifice with good conscience thousands of individuals for the sake of the human race. But the race, says Nietzsche, can only exist by such sacrifices (Menschenopfer). On the Christian assumption, only self-sacrifice is allowed, but this "remnant of sacrifice" has no value at all from the viewpoint of the total discipline and improvement of the race (Gesamtzüchtung). I would, however, admit that in our time the rediscovery of Christianity might be more convincingly achieved by men who went through the most radical negation than by professional Christians. Following a parable of St. Paul. one might say that Nietzsche, like the gentiles formerly, could become a wild olive branch grafted into the old Jewish-Christian tree the natural branches of which were broken off by their unbelief.

But the situation is much more complicated today than at the time of the Jewish apostle of the Christian gospel to the gentiles. The trouble of contemporary Christianity is that there is no genuine paganism, neither in Europe nor in America, against which Christianity could once more become what it was. Since our world is nominally Christian and actually secularized, one has "to introduce Christianity into Christendom," to use a phrase of Kierkegaard. This is, however, much more difficult than to introduce it into paganism. The problem of a decision either for or against Christianity is now involved in ambiguity. But how then decide, as Nietzsche suggests, between Dionysos and Christ? Has Nietzsche any genuine access to the world of the Greeks? Or is he perhaps less "pagan" than Goethe and Hölderlin to whom Christ and Dionysos were two divine brothers? I venture to say he is, and this for two main reasons: first, by being entirely preoccupied with the *future* of man's destiny, and second, by his *will* to the ancient cosmos of eternal recurrence.

To explain the first point: no Greek was primarily concerned with the distant future of man's destiny. Future was to them predetermined by fate and therefore subject to divination. All their mythologies, genealogies, and histories re-presented to them their past. There is not a single serious reflection upon the future prospects of history, either in Herodotus, or in Thucydides, or Polybius. All of them took the supreme law of the cosmos, i. e., the law of growth and decay, for granted. Whatever will happen will be of the same pattern as the present and past events. The perversion of the classical historical consciousness into our modern, anticipating one is in the last analysis due to the Jewish-Christian outlook on history which is based on faith as hope and expectation, and thereby directed towards the future, either defined by a definite eschaton or by an indefinite idea of progress. It was Christianity in the line of the prophets which opened this new dimension of anxiety and hope. of dynamic and progressive thinking, and revolutionary action into the future. Little has changed in this respect between Isaiah on the one side, and Marx, Kierkegaard, Donoso Cortes, Dostoevsky, and Nietzsche on the other side, between the old and the new prophets. For all of them are terribly concerned with the history of the future and with the past only under this perspective, namely, as a promise to it. Hence, they pass judgment upon their present. Even to Nietzsche the present and the past are only a necessary prerequisite to a future goal. Zarathustra, the victor over God and Nothingness, is the "redeeming man of the Future." Nietzsche's whole philosophy is one great "Prelude of a philosophy of the Future" as he called Beyond Good and Evil. As a prelude to a distant but definite future Nietzsche's philosophy is a secularized and again desecularized eschatology.

All this is entirely un-Greek, not classic, not pagan, but derived from the Jewish-Christian tradition.

To explain the second point: Nietzsche's philosophy is also entirely un-Greek by his effort to will the cyclic cosmos which is beyond will and purpose. The Greeks were impressed by the visible order and beauty of the cosmos, and the cyclic movements of the heavenly spheres were to them divine. The view of the eternal recurrence of generation and corruption was to them satisfactory because of being a rational interpretation of the universe which combines the recognition of temporal changes with periodic regularity, constancy, and immutability. In the intellectual climate of the Greeks there was no room for the unique, incomparable historic event—neither for Christ nor for the year one of Nietzsche's *Ecce Homo*. Their view of the world was to them conveyed not by a transcendent faith but by sensual perception and reasoned conclusion. It was a sensible world.

The same view of eternal recurrences is to Nietzsche "the most frightful" conception and "the heaviest burden." Why is it a burden? Because it bears upon his will. The belief that everything will return in an aimless circle is indeed frightful if set over against a purposeful will which is always a will to a new future. Thus Nietzsche was unable to develop his vision like the Greeks as a supreme and objective order, but introduced it as a subjective ethical imperative: to live "as if" everything would return, in order to impress on each action the weight of an inescapable responsibility for the future. The theory of the eternal recurrence becomes to him an ethical device and "hammer," substituting that sense of responsibility which was alive in Christianity as long as man lived in the presence of God and in the expectation of a last judgment.

But since the will does not move in a circle but in a straight and irreversible direction, the crucial problem of Zarathustra becomes "the redemption" of the will from its own one-dimensional structure. Yet how can the will integrate itself with the cyclic law of the cosmos where every movement of advance is at the same time a movement of return? Nietzsche's answer is: the will must redeem itself from itself by willing also backward, i. e., by accepting voluntarily what it did not will, the whole past of all that is already done and existent, in particular the

¹⁹ The Joyful Wisdom, paragraph 341.

fact of our own existence which nobody has produced by his will.²⁰ All this is entirely un-Greek, not classic, not pagan, but derived from the Jewish-Christian tradition, in particular from the belief that world and man are created by God's purposeful will. Even in Nietzsche's godless philosophy nothing is more conspicuous than the emphasis on being creative and willing, creative by willing. To the Greeks human creativeness was an "imitation of Nature"

Genuine paganism of classical antiquity is indeed gone and not to be revived. Not only our outlook on the future (beyond "the duration" and toward a "better world") and our reliance upon the power of the will, but also our moralized attitude to those powers of nature which are manifested in sexual procreation and its organs, make classic paganism a beautiful dream. It is pathetic to think that a man like Nietzsche glorified the innocence and holiness of procreation as the triumphant Yea to the eternal recurrence of life.²¹ Only occasionally did Nietzsche realize that what separates us forever from the ancient culture is that its religious and social foundations, in mythos and polis, are completely gone, and that our only access to it is by the "rainbow of concepts." Actually the classic culture has only survived insofar as it has been assimilated on Roman soil by the Christian Church. Compared with puritan New England. Catholic Italy is a pagan country; Rome, where almost every Christian church is built in and upon a pagan temple, demonstrates this assimilation most strikingly. It is all a "Santa Maria sopra Minerva." This material and spiritual synthesis of Christianity and antiquity was broken up by Luther, a man as great as he was unintellectual. The Reformation alienated us from antiquity by rediscovering the old contradiction of Christianity and paganism. In his protest against the medieval synthesis of Christian faith and Greek philosophy, Luther took St. Paul without his Hellenism and Augustine without his Platonism. But what else is Nietzsche's decision between Christ and Dionysos than a last consequence of Luther's separation between the two great sources of European civilization, in spite of his understanding of the Reformation as a destructive revolt against Western tradition? He could not help remaining a Lutheran Protestant and a classical philologist, profoundly im-

²⁰ See my book on Nietzsche's Philosophie der ewigen Wiederkunft (Berlin, 1935).
21 The Twilight of the Idols, 118f.

pressed by, and longing for, the ancient world in its unmixed purity. One of the most moving words in Nietzsche's last letter to Burckhardt, written shortly after the onset of insanity. is his confession of gratitude for the ancient world "for which, however, men of today are not simple and quiet enough,"22

Except for those who still feel at home in the scholastic synthesis of Aristotle and Augustine or in the humanistic equilibrium of "Homer and the Bible," Nietzsche's problem of a decision between Christianity and antiquity remains decisive. Just because we are still living on the capital of both it is indeed a crucial question whether the world is eternal or created. whether it is a circle or under the *Cross*, whether it is moving in cycles or toward an eschaton, whether man is included in nature or elevated above it by being created in the image of an un-natural God. This alternative does not, however, mean that both ways of thinking are merely historical "interpretations" and on the same level. The Christian view of the world is first of all not a "view" but a matter of faith in things invisible, and the world of eternal recurrences is neither a prejudice of the Greeks nor an invention of Nietzsche but an abiding truth, as true and natural as the eternal recurrence of generation and corruption, of summer and winter, of sunrise and sunset. The question is only if that is the whole truth.23

²² See also The Will to Power, paragraph 419. 23 Schelling, The Ages of the World (New York, 1942), 119 and 153.

THE HISTORIOGRAPHY OF THE MENNONITES IN THE NETHERLANDS

A GUIDE TO SOURCES

Cornelius Krahn
Bethel College, North Newton, Kansas

This study is not intended to give a complete bibliography of contributions by or on Dutch Mennonites. The writer plans to do this in a later study. This article is limited to giving an outline of the historiography of the Dutch Mennonites and to tracing the trends of development in this field. The main writers and their works will be mentioned.

Since the Mennonites of the Lower Rhine (Crefeld, etc.) and Lower Elbe (Hamburg, Emden, etc.) until recent times formed an organic unity with those of The Netherlands, they will be included. Literature of the Anabaptism of Münster will be mentioned but briefly since it is generally known and accessible. Emphasis will be placed on Dutch literature by Mennonite writers.

In his article, The Historiography of the German Reformation During the Last Twenty Years, Wilhelm Pauck has pointed out that a rapid increase in research in the field of Anabaptistica of late is due to the need of filling out the picture of the beginning of Protestantism and to the fact that modern descendants of sectarians have begun to make scholarly contributions to their history. The writer is in full agreement with this statement but would like to add that the Mennonites of The Netherlands have been making more or less scholarly contributions to the history of Anabaptism for about two centuries. Since H. Schyn wrote his Historia Christianorum . . . (1723), a steady increase of research in Holland can be observed.

Let us briefly consider two questions. First, how do we account for the fact that the Mennonites of The Netherlands made scholarly contributions concerning their history long before their co-religionists in other countries? Secondly, why is this wealth of literature so little known among scholars abroad?

¹ Church History IX, (1940), 336.

May we attempt to answer the latter question first. Most of the literature on Dutch Anabaptism by Dutch writers is written in the language of a comparatively small country. Therefore few American scholars could undertake the task of acquainting themselves with this literature.²

The first question requires a more detailed answer. Although the founders of the Anabaptists in Switzerland were university trained, they produced little significant literature. since most of them were exterminated after a few years by the cruel persecution of their age. Thus Anabaptism of southern Europe became a faith of the lower classes and the peasantry. Since that time Anabaptism has largely been limited to rural people living in isolation from the "world." The Low Countries, however, are an exception. Here Anabaptism began predominantly as a movement among the lower classes of the cities. In The Netherlands the Mennonites shunned the "world" more consistently and extremely than anywhere else, but being mainly urban and sharing the wealth and opportunities of the Golden Age of the country, the more progressive factions of Dutch Mennonitism gradually became secularized. They began to take part in all functions of the social, cultural, economic, and political life of the country. Soon we find among them men like the great writer, Joost van den Vondel, the poet and painter. Carel van Mander, the painter Rembrandt, and others. Thus it is not surprising that the quest of scholarly inquiry into the beginnings of their own history could grow and develop in an atmosphere like this.

Let us now outline the different periods in the development of Dutch Mennonite historiography. When a movement originates in struggle and persecution there is little time for retrospection and objective description of facts. This was especially true in the case of the Dutch Anabaptists, who for a long time were persecuted, gradually tolerated, and finally granted freedom. The early literature relating to them, as during the first centuries of the Christian Church, was produced by both friend and foe. Controversy is the characteristic of all historic literature of this period. And Anabaptism did not struggle only with the foe outside of the flock but also within its brotherhood.

² Among them we would like to mention H. E. Dosker's studies on Dutch Anabaptism, Roland H. Bainton's biography of David Joris, and the studies on European Anabaptism (including The Netherlands) by C. Henry Smith and the late John Horsch.

The attempt to establish a church "without spot or wrinkle" caused the internal controversy. Accordingly, before we enter the field of modern historiography, we intend to follow the highlights of this controversial literature as far as it has value for the historian of Mennonitism.

I. Controversial Historical Literature (1530-1740)

The Period of External Controversy

Soon after the seed of Anabaptism had been sown in the Low Countries by Melchior Hofmann (1531), the controversy in this matter began. It found its most potent source in the catastrophe of Anabaptism in Münster (1535). For centuries this tragic episode overshadowed all reports and even serious research in the field of Anabaptistica. On the other hand the peaceful Mennonites attempted to prove that there was no connection between them and the revolutionary Anabaptists.

Before Menno Simons withdrew from the Catholic Church and became the leader of the Dutch Anabaptists he wrote "a very clear and explicit" pamphlet against Ian van Leiden, the king of the New Jerusalem (1535).3 But Menno Simons was involved in religious discussions with more worthy opponents than Jan van Leiden. John à Lasco, reformer of East Frisia, had a religious debate with Menno Simons in Emden in 1544, after which Menno handed him his confession of faith.4 A Lasco replied to this. Gellius Faber, who had participated in the above-mentioned debate, wrote a pamphlet against the Anabaptists in which he denied the proper calling of the Anabaptist ministers.6 In answering this challenge Menno gives the most detailed and valuable information concerning his development as a priest and consequent conversion to Anabaptism.⁷

An early and outstanding Catholic opponent of Menno Simons and the Anabaptists was M. Duncanus.8 The strongest

³ Menno Simons, Opera omnia theologica (Amsterdam, 1681), 619-631; or Complete Works of Menno Simons (Elkhart, 1871), II, 425-440.
4 Opera omnia, 517-542; Complete Works, II, 325-350.
5 J. à Lasco, Opera, ed. A. Kuyper (1866), I, 1-60.

⁶ Gellius Faber, Eine antwert . . . vp einen bitterhönischen bereff der Wedderdöper (Magdeburg, 1552).

⁷ Een klare beantwoordinge over een schrift Gellii Fabri, Opera, 225-324; Complete Works, II, 1-105.

⁸ Anabaptisticae haeresos confutatio et vere Christiani baptismi ac potissimum paedobaptismatis assertio, adversus M. Simonis Frisii virulentas de baptismo blasphemias (1549).

attack by a representative of the Reformed Church of this time was made by Guydo de Bray.9 The great reformed theologian Dathenus was not only the chief opponent of the Anabaptists at the Frankenthal Debate (1571) but also a writer against them. 10 G. Nicolai translated H. Bullinger's Adversus anabaptistas and added a refutation of Dutch Anabaptism (1569).11 There is a complete account of a religious debate held at Emden (1578) between representatives of the Reformed Church and the Mennonites lasting 124 sessions. 22 A similar debate consisting of 156 sessions was held at Leeuwarden in 1593.13 Peter van Keulen was the outstanding representative of the Mennonites at both places.

J. P. van der Meulen wrote the Successio Apostolica (1600) to prove that the Anabaptist Church was in direct lineal descent from the Apostolic Church. A Catholic priest (Simon Walraven) answered this in the well known Successio Anabaptistica (1603). The latter proved to be an important source for Mennonite history, and was reprinted by S. Cramer (BRN, VII). H. Faukelius, a Reformed minister, wrote Babel, d. i. Verwerringhe der Weder-dooperen onder malkanderen (1621), in which he attempted to produce evidence of the weakness and heresy of Anabaptism because of its numerous divisions. This was answered by A. Roscinus, among others, in Babel, d. i. Verwerringe der Kinderooperen onder malcanderen (1626). He pointed out that, on the same grounds, the believers in infant baptism must be guilty of greater heresy since there were more divisions among them than among the Anabaptists. J. Cloppenburch was another minister who wrote against the Anabaptists.¹⁴ A well-known source on Anabaptism is Grouwelen der vornaemster Hooft-Ketteren . . . (1623) which was originally published in Latin and translated into German and Dutch. 15 I. Hoornbeek, a Reformed theologian, wrote numerous books

⁹ La racine, source et fondement des anabaptistes ou rebaptisez de nostre temps (1565). A number of reprints of a Dutch translation appeared. See Kühler, Geschiedenis der Nederlandsche Doopsgezinden in de Zestiende Eeuw (Haarlem, 1923), 440.

¹⁰ S. Blaupot ten Cate, Geschiedenis der Doopsgezinden in Holland, Zeeland, Utrecht

en Gelderland (Amsterdam, 1847), II, 215-16. 11 Inlasschingen in het vertaalde werk v. Bullinger: "Teghens de Wederdoopers," (Embden, 1569). Reprinted in Bibliotheca Reformatoria Neerlandica, VII.

¹² Kühler, Geschiedenis, 447 ff.

¹⁴ Gangraena Theologiae Anabaptisticae (Franckerae, 1645).

¹⁵ Catalogus, 7; see p. 206.

concerning the Anabaptists, among which Summae controversarium religionis (1658) is outstanding. His colleague, F. F. Spanheim, also participated in this controversy. His book. Selectarum de religione controversiarum elenchus (1687), was answered by the Mennonite minister, Engel Arendszoon van Dooregeest, in "Brief aan den Heer F. Spanhemius Prof. der H. Godsgeleertheyt en der Historien tot Leyden." Another outstanding defender of the Mennonite cause was the wellknown physician and minister of the Mennonite Church at Amsterdam, Galenus Abrahamsz de Haan, in his Verdediging der Christenen die Doopsgezinde genaamd worden, beneffens korte grondstellingen van hun gelove en leere (Amsterdam, 1699). G. Roosen, pastor of the Mennonite Church at Altona (Elbe), wrote Unschuld u. Gegen-Bericht der Evangel. Tauffgesinnten Christen, so Mennonisten genandt werden . . . (Ratzeburg, 1702). Among the many books of devotional, controversial, and historical character written by Pieter Jansz Twisck we mention in this connection his Chronick van den Ondergangh der Tyrannen (2 vols., 1604 and 1628).18

About the middle of the eighteenth century a revival of the controversy occurred, for the Mennonites were accused by their Reformed neighbors of harboring Socinian beliefs. This accusation centered mainly around the gifted Mennonite minister, J. Stinstra.¹⁹ A case similar to Stinstra's was that of A. van der Os.²⁰ W. J. Dowen in his Socinianen en Doopsgezinden (Leiden, 1898), W. J. Kühler in Het Socinianisme in Nederland (Leiden, 1912), and J. C. van Slee in De Geschiedenis van het Socinianisme in de Nederlanden,²¹ give a detailed account of this controversy.²²

The article, "De Nederlansche Gereformede Synoden tegenover de Doopsgezinden (1563-1620)" by F. S. Knipscher, discusses the relationship of the Reformed Synods to the Mennonites. The proceedings of the Reformed Synods were published by Reitsma and van Veen in *Acta der Provinciale en Particuliere Synoden* (I-VII, 1892-1898).

¹⁶ S. Blaupot ten Cate, Geschiedenis, II, 222-223.

¹⁷ Mennonitisches Lexicon, I, 466.

¹⁸ For other writings in this connection by the same author see Catalogus, 198-199. 19 Chr. Sepp wrote Johannes Stinstra en zijn tijd (2 vols., Amsterdam, 1865-66).

²⁰ See Catalogus, 140-146.

²¹ Teylers Godgeleerd Genootschap, N. S. XVIII (Haarlem, 1914).

²² For further literature on this controversy see Catalogus, 109-146.

²³ Doopsgezinde Bijtragen (Leiden, 1910 and 1911).

2. Devotional Literature and Internal Controversy

The sixteenth century brought to a climax the attempt of the Mennonites to establish a church "without spot or wrinkle" after the apostolic model. This finds its reflection far into the seventeenth century in devotional and historical literature. Throughout this period the ideal of the Mennonites was a quiet and peaceful life in seclusion from the world, a natural reaction to the catastrophe of Münster and the years of persecution. But the Dutch Golden Age of the seventeenth century lured many of them out of their isolation. Since they were largely an urban people, this was a comparatively rapid process. Whatever the names of the persons and movements which waxed and waned into the eighteenth century, it was usually a struggle between the adherents of the sixteenth century "mennist" concept of a pure Christian Church with the enforcement of rigid church discipline, and the broader concept of the more liberal and tolerant factions. Names, persons, and ideas changed in this struggle, but the trend remained the same until the modern and progressive spirit of the "Doopsgezinde" became predominant and the conservative "mennist" spirit gradually disappeared.24 This modern and tolerant attitude of the "Doopsgezinde" developed in opposition not only to rigid earlier Mennonitism but also to the intolerant and harsh Dutch Calvinism. In other words, the liberal "Doopsgezinde," along with the Remonstrants and other Dutch liberals, became a significant factor in forming a cultural left wing in a predominantly orthodox Calvinistic country. To a large extent this accounts for the fact that the Mennonites of The Netherlands differ in certain respects from those of other countries.

After this introduction it will be clear that historical source material can be expected in both devotional and controversial literature. Furthermore, in some instances it is hard to distinguish between the two types, since a given book may have both purposes.

A number of books by Menno Simons and Dirk Philips deal with matters of internal controversy. Outstanding are

^{24 &}quot;Doopsgezinde" literally means "baptism minded" people (Taufgesinnte).

This is the official name of the Mennonites of Holland and Switzerland. After the above mentioned development, "Doopsgezinde" implies a certain tolerant, individualistic type of piety in opposition to a narrow orthodoxy.

questions of church discipline, that is, excommunication and shunning.25 A valuable objective account of the origin and the divisions among the early Anabaptists was written by Obbe He was the one who had baptized Menno Simons and his own brother. Dirk Philips, but later withdrew from the brotherhood. A similarly significant source is Het beginsel en voortganck der geschillen, scheuringen, en verdeeltheden . . . (Amsterdam, 1658).27

The outstanding contribution which the Anabaptists of the sixteenth century made in the field of devotional and historical literature was the compilation and publication of Het Offer des Heeren (1562), the first edition of the famous collection of biographies, testimonies, and songs of Anabaptist martyrs.²⁸ The prominent writer and leader of the more liberal Mennonites (Waterlanders), Hans de Ries, enlarged this collection considerably and had it published in 1615 under the title Historie der Martelaaren. P. J. Twisck, a voluminous writer and representative of the more conservative Mennonites (Old Frisians). edited a reprint of this edition for his churches and added a confession of faith (1617). The resulting controversy brought forth a significant description of the inner conditions of the Mennonite Church during the latter part of the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries in Hans Alenson's Tegen-Bericht ob de voor-Reden van't groote Martelaer Boeck der Doobs-Ghesinde (1630).20

Better known is the enlarged edition of the Martyrs' Mirror edited by Tielemann Jansz van Braght under the following title: Het Bloedigh Tooneel der Doops-gezinde en Weereloose Christenen, die om het getuygenisse Jesus . . . geleden hebben en gedoodt zijn, v. Christi tijdt af, tot dese onse laetste tijden toe. Mitsgaders, een beschrijvinge des H. Doops e. a. stucken. Begrepen in twee boecken. Zijnde een vergrootinge v. den voorgaenden Martelaers-Spiegel (Dordrecht, 1660).30 Later editions

²⁵ Cornelius Krahn, Menno Simons (Karlsruhe, 1936), 88-96. 26 Bekenntenisse (Amsterdam, 1584). Reprinted in BRN, VII. 27 Reprinted in BRN, VII. Formerly ascribed to Carel van Ghent.
28 Reprinted in BRN, II.
29 Reprinted in BRN, VII.

³⁰ For further literature on Anabaptist martyrology see Mennonitisches Lexikon. Catalogus, 14-16. W. J. Kühler, Geschiedenis, 245-277. W. J. Kühler, Geschiedenis van de Doopsgezinden in Nederland (Haarlem, 1940), II, 97-115. See also footnote 38 on J. Mehrning, who is supposed to have influenced the Dutch

were illustrated by the Mennonite artist and poet, Jan Luyken. T. J. van Braght's book is not merely a compilation of facts and biographies concerning the Anabaptist martyrs, as the previous edition had been, but an attempt to interpret history. In tracing the history of the martyrs from the Apostolic Church down to the Anabaptist persecution he concludes that the true Christian Church has always had its martyrs. He also includes a history of baptism in his book proving that adult baptism was practiced during the first centuries of the Christian Church and later replaced by infant baptism.

Until the middle of the seventeenth century the internal controversy in Holland centered mainly around questions of the degree of rigidness and strictness of church discipline and the attitude of the church toward the world. This divided the Mennonites into numerous factions such as Waterlanders, Frisians, Flemish, and others, which in turn were subdivided into various lesser branches. Then a great new upheaval overshadowed the former divisions and caused the formation of two main wings. This was caused by the rationalistic-pietistic movement of the Collegians and the Socinians, mentioned above in connection with the discussion on the external controversy of the Mennonites.

A brilliant physician, Galenus Abrahamsz de Haan, minister of the Flemish Mennonite Church of Amsterdam, became the central figure of the Collegian movement in The Netherlands. His chief opponent was his colleague, Samuel Apostool, also a physician and minister in the same church. The latter represented the conservative Mennonite groups, while the former, influenced by modern trends and thought of his time, advocated a liberal reformation of his church. Being an outstanding and influential leader he had a large following. The controversy resulted in a split in the Amsterdam church in 1664 and gradually spread throughout the country. The followers of G. A. de Haan were known as "Lamists" and those of Apostool as "Zonists" from the names of their respective meetinghouses in Amsterdam. From the flood of pamphlets and writings which resulted from this controversy we select only a few typical titles. Theodore van der Meer wrote Het Gekraay van een Sociniaanse

Mennonite interpretation of its history. But it should be remembered that writers like Menno Simons, Dirk Philips, and others trace their church and mode of baptism back to the Apostolic Church and even further.

Haan, onder Doopsgezinde Veederen (1663). An outstanding anonymous pamphlet was Lammerenkrijah (1663).32

II. BEGINNINGS OF HISTORIOGRAPHY

During the first half of the eighteenth century the historiography of the Dutch Mennonites became more scholarly. It was, however, not the liberal wing that made the first contribution of this type. To be sure, they had founded a theological seminary at Amsterdam in 1735, but their main interest centered around current problems. Some of these problems dealt with the relationship of religion to natural science, philosophy, etc. The spirit of unlimited tolerance and growing indifference which was spreading among them was not conducive to appreciation and study of their past. It is, therefore, evident that this progressive wing of the Mennonites could not at this time make any significant scholarly contributions in this field. At the threshold of modern historiography in The Netherlands we find representatives of the conservative "Zonists" like H. Schyn, Gerardus Maatschoen, and M. Schagen.³³

The first book of H. Schyn, Korte historie der protestante Christenen, die men Mennoniten of Doopsgezinden noemt, etc. (Amsterdam, 1711), was written for the general public. Encouraged by the fact that scholars abroad made wide use of it, he wrote a Latin version of his book,34 which was followed by a second volume.35 M. van Maurik translated these two volumes into the Dutch (1727 and 1738). G. Maatschoen, like Schyn, a minister and physician at Amsterdam, made another translation and added a preface, annotations, illustrations, and a third volume.³⁶ Although these men were not full-fledged historians in the modern sense of the term, they produced a significant piece of work in compiling much valuable material. They viewed past and present controversial matters objectively and encouraged

^{31 &}quot;The Crow of a Socinian Rooster Decked with Mennonite Feathers."

^{32 &}quot;The War of the Lambs" has reference to the name "Lamists" and their principle of non-resistance. Similarly descriptive titles include 't Gescheurde Schaaps-kleedt van Dr. Galenus Abrahamsz (Leyden, 1663); Schuit-praatje (Amsterdam 1664); Straat-praatje; see Catalogus, 109 ff.

³³ S. Blaupot ten Cate, Geschiedenis, II, 141.

³⁴ Historia Christianorum qui in Belgi Foeder, inter Protestantes Mennonitae appellantur (Amsterdam, 1723). 35 Historiae Mennonitarum plenior deductio, etc. (Amsterdam, 1729).

³⁶ Geschiedenis dier Christenan, welke in de Vereenigde Nederlanden onder de Protestanten Mennoniten genaamd worden (Amsterdam, 1743-45).

others to continue along these lines. Another ardent collector of Anabaptistica and the author of a book on the Waldenses was Marten Schagen, linguist, book dealer, and minister. He was the translator of F. S. Rues's Aufrichtige Nachrichten von dem Gegenwärtigen Zustande der Mennoniten . . . (Jena, 1843). The extent of the libraries of the latter and G. Maatschoen, as revealed in the printed catalogs, indicates their extraordinary interest and knowledge in this new field of study.

Among the non-Mennonite writers we should mention Jakob Mehrning,³⁸ the Remonstrant historian Geeraert Brandt,³⁹ A. Moubach and B. Picard.⁴⁰

The second half of the eighteenth century is marked by a general indifference and decline of the Dutch Mennonite church life. Both numerically and spiritually the group reached its lowest level at the end of the century. It is true that in 1778 the noted Teyler's Godgeleerd Genootschap of Haarlem was founded and has contributed, especially of late, to the furtherance of research in the field of Anabaptistica. At that time, however, the relationship of religion to natural science and philosophy was, in accordance with the general spirit of the age, the main concern of the organization. Thus we see that Mennonite historiography received a set-back from which it did not recover before the beginning of the nineteenth century.

III. A CENTURY OF HISTORIOGRAPHY (1840-1940)

The beginning of the nineteenth century marks a new era in the history of Dutch Mennonitism. The most sincere and loyal among them realized the necessity of uniting the scattered churches and the divided forces of the small brotherhood. After a number of local unions had been formed, the *Algemeene Doopsgezinde Societeit* was organized in 1811. This organiza-

³⁷ Tegenw. Staet der Doopsgezinden of Mennoniten, in de Vereen. Nederlanden (Amsterdam, 1745).

³⁸ S. Baptismi Historia: Das ist / Heilige Tauff-Historia / In welcher die Wahrheit der Ersten-Ein-und-Eygentlichen Tauffordnung Jesu Christi, aus heiliger Schrifft deutlich widerholt / darzu aus vielen Alten und Newen / Kirchenhistorien durch alle Hundert Jährige Zeiten von Anfang der Tauff biszhieher bezeuget / Und wie solche fast nach allen Hauptstücken / offt verändert / und in schädliche Miszbräuch verkehret sey worden (Dortmundt, 1646-47).

³⁹ Historie der Reformatie (4 volumes, Amsterdam, 1671-1704).

⁴⁰ Naaukeurige Beschryving der uitwendige Godstdienst-plichten (6 volumes, Amsterdam, 1727-1738).

⁴¹ Pieter Teyler van der Hulst, a Mennonite of Haarlem, was instrumental in founding this organization through a bequest.

tion included nearly all the Mennonite congregations of The Netherlands and the adjacent German Mennonite churches. The general and main purpose of this organization was to care for the spiritual and economic welfare of the churches and to prevent further decline. To accomplish this the newly established A. D. S. accepted the supervision of the Mennonite Theological Seminary at Amsterdam, which had thus far been taken care of by the local church, and gave financial support to small churches which could not provide for themselves.

The revived church life as well as the newly established church unions aroused historical interest. From this time forth the Mennonite Theological Seminary of Amsterdam remained the center of Mennonite historical research. Efficient professors and librarians collected and preserved, in the library and archives of the Mennonite Church of Amsterdam, what is now known as the best collection of *Anabaptistica*.

The first of the professors to pioneer in this field was Samuel Muller. He introduced a course of Mennonite history at the seminary and founded and edited the Jaarboekje voor de Doopsgezinde Gemeenten in Nederland (1837-1850). In addition, he wrote numerous articles and collected much material. Furthermore, he inspired his students of theology to continue his work. Two other men deserve mention for their work as pioneers at this time. A. M. Cramer wrote the first comprehensive biography of Menno Simons. S. Blaupot ten Cate was the author of an extensive and scholarly history of the Mennonites of The Netherlands which is indispensable even today.

1. The Origin of Anabaptism

The relationship between the Münsterite Anabaptists and Dutch Mennonitism had always been a touchy subject for the earlier Mennonite writers. From the time of the writings of

⁴² See Chr. Sepp, Bibliothek van Nederlandsche Kergeschiedschrijvers (Leiden, 1886) 386-87; ML, III, 180-91; Catalogus, 300.

⁴³ Het leven en de verrigtingen van Menno Simons (Amsterdam, 1837).

⁴⁴ Geschiedenis der Doopsgezinden in Friesland (Leeuwarden, 1839); Geschiedenis der Doopsgezinden in Groningen, Overijssel en Oost-Friesland (Leeuwarden, 1842), two volumes in one; Geschiedenis der Doopsgezinden in Holland, Zeeland, Utrecht en Gelderland (Amsterdam, 1847), two volumes in one.

J. G. de Hoop Scheffer, professor and librarian at Amsterdam, was editor of the *Doopsgezinde Bijdragen* and a pioneer historian. Christiaan Sepp also carried on extensive research in the field of *Anabaptistica*. In addition to the book mentioned in note 42, he wrote *Geschiedkundige Nasporingen* (3 vols., Leyden, 1872-75), etc.

Menno Simons against Jan van Leyden and Menno's Fundamentboek45 until the history of the Mennonites was written by Schyn-Maatschoen, the main object was that of defense. The opponents emphasized the similarities which pointed to a common origin with the fanatic elements in Anabaptism, while the Mennonite writers denied or minimized this and attempted to prove the Biblical character of their church which they traced back, hypothetically, to the Apostolic Church. The interpretation of the history of the Mennonites by T. J. van Braght in the Martyr's Mirror has been mentioned before. In this Successio Apostolica⁴⁶ theory the Waldenses furnished a welcome link. Outstanding among those who did research in the history of the Waldenses and their supposed connection with the Anabaptists was A. M. Cramer in his above-mentioned book on Menno Simons (1837). He, as well as S. Blaupot ten Cate, did not find any definite evidence of a direct lineage from the Waldenses to the Anabaptists. I. H. Halbertsma based his theory of this historical connection on the similarities between the Waldenses and the Anabaptists. 47 This proved to be a challenge for further research in that field. Blaupot ten Cate wrote Geschiedkundig onderzoek naar den Waldensischen oorsprong van de Nederlandsche Doopsgezinde (Amsterdam, 1844), while others made contributions of lesser importance to this field.48 However, even after the Dutch Mennonite historians had given up this theory, a staunch advocate of it arose in the German historian and archivist, Ludwig Keller. In his numerous writings, he advocated the theory of the direct descent of the Anabaptists from what he called the pre-Reformation Old-Evangelical Brethren Churches. In this chain of Evangelical Churches, the Waldenses formed an important link.49

Returning to the relationship of the Münsterite Anabaptists to the Dutch Mennonites, it should be stated that it was the research of the Catholic scholar, C. A. Cornelius, which changed the approach to the problem radically.⁵⁰ From that time both Catholic and Protestant scholars gradually gave increasingly

⁴⁵ Cornelius Krahn, "Menno Simons' Fundament-boek." MQR, October, 1939.

⁴⁶ This is the title of the above-mentioned book by J. P. van der Meulen.

⁴⁷ De Doopsgezinden en hunne herkomst (Deventer, 1843).

⁴⁸ See also Blaupot ten Cate, Geschiedenis der Doopsgezinden in Holland, 365-81.

 ⁴⁹ Die Reformation und die älteren Reformparteien (1866), and other publications.
 50 See ML, I, 372-374; II, 98. Outstanding among his writings are Berichte der Augenzeugen über das Münsterische Wiedertäuferreich (Münster, 1853); Geschichte des Münsterischen Aufruhrs (2 vols., Leipzig, 1855-1860).

unprejudiced consideration to the Anabaptist movement of the sixteenth century. Especially the following historians and sociologists are to be mentioned in this connection: L. Keller, K. Müller, E. Troeltsch, M. Weber, A. Harnack, and W. Köhler. They are chiefly responsible for the fact that the Anabaptists are no longer considered the *Stiefkinderen van het Christendom*, 51 but legitimate offspring of the Reformation.

The manner in which the assertion of a connection between the Mennonites and the Münsterite Anabaptists was revived in our own century is an irony of history. This time it was not a debate between an "orthodox" Catholic or Protestant and a "heretic" Anabaptist, but a lively and lengthy discussion between the two leading Dutch Mennonite historians of this time. It was a controversy between K. Vos, minister and historian, and W. Kühler, professor of the Mennonite Theological Sem-

inary and the University at Amsterdam.

In 1917 Vos published (in DB) Kleine bijdragen over de Doopersche beweging in Nederland tot het optreden van Menno Influenced by the materialistic and socialistic interpretation of the Münster incident. Vos does not hesitate to consider the chiliastic and revolutionary element of Anabaptism, as it found its most extreme expression in the Kingdom of Münster, as genuine original Dutch Anabaptism. According to this interpretation, the biblicist peaceful element become dominant after the Münster catastrophe through falling from one extreme to another. Kühler replied to this in his article Het Nederlandsche Anabaptisme en de revolutionnaire woelingen der zestiende eeuw (DB, 1919). This in turn was answered by Vos in Revolutionnaire Hervorming (De Gids, LXXXIV, 1920). Kühler concluded the controversy with his Het Anabaptisme in Nederland (De Gids, 1921). In his article, as well as in his subsequently published history of the Mennonites in The Netherlands, Kühler emphasizes that the biblicist peaceful type of Anabaptism, without the practicing of adult baptism, existed in The Netherlands before the preaching and baptizing of M. Hofmann in 1531 (in the Sacramentist movement, the Brethren of the Common Life, etc.). Hofmann and his preachers were reaping without sowing. After Hofmann had been taken captive, the Anabaptist movement split into two groups: the left wing of Münster, and the right wing of Obbe and Dirk

⁵¹ A book by J. Lindeboom ('S Gravenhage, 1929).

Philips, Menno Simons, and others. No doubt Kühler came closer to the historical truth than Vos, even though he probably over-emphasized the independence of the reformatory movement in The Netherlands.

2. General and Local History

In addition to the above-mentioned histories on the origin of the Dutch Anabaptists some earlier and some recent monographs and studies of a general character deserve mention. The Mennonite historians of the nineteenth century, S. Müller, de Hoop Sheffer, S. Cramer, and others furnished a number of articles of the Mennonites, Menno Simons, etc. for the internationally known encyclopedias of different countries. De Hoop Scheffer's article, "Korte geschiedenis der Mennoniten en Doopsgezinden" (DB, 1882), translated from the second edition of the Real-Encyclopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche. 52 and S. Cramer's article, "Mennoniten," in the third edition of this work, deserve special mention. The latter also wrote, among other contributions, a significant study on "De Doopsgezinde Broederschap in de negentiende eeuw' (DB, 1901) and a survey of Dutch Mennonite statistics of the nineteenth century (DB, 1902). Some of the many contributions of general and local nature by Christiaan Sepp have been mentioned previously.

The most significant history of the Mennonites of The Netherlands, after the afore-mentioned one by S. Blaupot ten Cate, was that of Anna Brons, *Ursprung*, *Entwicklung und Schicksale der altevangelischen Taufgesinnten oder Mennoniten in kurzen Zügen übersichtlich dargestellt* (Norden, 1884), which covers the history of all Mennonites.⁵³

The urgently felt need for a scholarly Dutch history of the Mennonites of The Netherlands grew stronger and stronger. At present this is being answered by the formerly mentioned W. Kühler, professor in the Amsterdam Seminary. In 1932 he published Geschiedenis der Nederlandsche Doopsgezinden in de zestiende eeuw (Haarlem), which was continued in 1940 when the first half of the second volume appeared, now entitled Geschiedenis van de Doopsgezinden in Nederland (Tweede

⁵² He wrote also Broederschap der Doopsgezinden. For additional literature see Chr. Sepp, Bibliotheek, 387-389.

⁵³ The third edition, revised by E. M. ten Cate, was published in Amsterdam, 1912.

deel, 1600-1735, eerste helft). Kühler's history is written in a splendid style and with a perfect mastery of the Dutch sources. However, in interpreting the great changes that have taken place in Dutch Mennonitism and distributing light and shadow between the conservative "Mennonites" and the progressive "Doopsgezinden" he is not entirely impartial. It is the weakness that the American Mennonite historian, John Horsch, attacks. In many instances his criticism may be justified, but in general he shows a similar inclination in the opposite extreme. Horsch writes from the more conservative American Mennonite point of view and Kühler from that of the modern *Doopsgezinde*. Thus it is not surprising that the interpretations of the two historians sometimes differ as widely as their geographic distance.

A general survey of early Anabaptism, including the Dutch, was written in England by R. J. Smithson entitled *The Anabaptists, Their Contributions to our Protestant Heritage* (London, 1935).

Valuable reports on various phases of Dutch Mennonitism were given at the Mennonite World Conference of Danzig and Amsterdam. Among the publications regarding local churches and provinces the following should be mentioned. The *Mennonitisches Lexikon* has, for instance, excellent articles on the Mennonite congregation and the Mennonite Theological Seminary of Amsterdam (I, 58-68). This estimable source which has thus far been completed to the letter "N," also contains histories of other small and large churches. For further literature one should consult the *Catalogus* of the Mennonite Library of Amsterdam (146-155, 287-297).

Let us now mention some of the publications dealing with the bordering churches along the Lower Rhine and Northwest Germany which until recent time were a cultural and linguistic unit with those of The Netherlands. There is valuable material in Max Goebel's Geschichte des christlichen Lebens in der rheinisch-westfälischen evangelischen Kirche (Koblenz, 1849-1860). Karl Rembert is the author of many publications on

 ^{54 &}quot;Is Dr. Kühler's Conception of Early Dutch Anabaptism Historically Sound?" Mennonite Quarterly Review, VII (1933), 48-64, 97-126.
 55 Neff, D. Christian, Mennonitische Welt-Hilfs-Konferenz (1930) in Danzig (Karls-

Mennonite Quarterly Review, VII (1955), 48-04, 91-120.

55 Neff, D. Christian, Mennonitische Welt-Hilfs-Konferenz (1930) in Danzig (Karlsruhe); Neff, D. Christian, Der Allgemeine Kongress der Mennoniten gehalten in Amsterdam, Elspeet, Witmarsum (Holland) 29. Juni bis 3. Juli 1936 (Karlsruhe); See also MQR, January, 1937.

the Mennonites along the Lower Rhine, among them Die Wiedertäufer im Herzogtum Jülich (Berlin, 1899). It was largely through the Mennonites that Krefeld became the center for the textile industry. This subject is treated by Paul Koch in his doctoral dissertation, Der Einfluss des Calvinismus und des Mennonitentums auf die Niederrheinische Textilindustrie. Ein Beitrag zu Max Webers: "Die Protestantische Ethik und der Geist des Kapitalismus" (Krefeld, 1928). One of the most recent contributions concerning the Mennonites in this region is Beiträge zur Geschichte rheinischer Mennoniten published by Mennonitischer Geschichtsverein (Weierhof, 1939). In his book. William Penn and the Dutch Quaker Migration to Pennsylvania (Swarthmore, Pa., 1935), W. J. Hull has made a significant contribution to the story of the migration of the Quaker-Mennonites from Krefeld to Germantown. His findings have not remained unchallenged. Especially the Mennonites of Germany objected to his conclusions that the founders of Germantown had been Dutch Ouakers and not German Mennonites.⁵⁶ A late and thorough study of these problems has been made by Friedrich Nieper in Die ersten deutschen Auswanderer von Krefeld nach Pennsylvanien. Ein Bild aus der religiösen Ideengeschichte des 17. und 18. Jahrhunderts (Neukirchen, 1940). The Mennonitische Geschichtsblätter published by the Mennonitischer Geschichtsverein (Weierhof since 1936) not only contain significant articles on the Mennonites in general, but also regularly list all publications on the Mennonites which appear in either book form or periodicals.

Let us now turn to the Mennonites of North Germany adjacent to The Netherlands. J. P. Müller wrote Die Mennoniten in Ostfriesland (Emden, 1887). An earlier history of the Mennonites of Hamburg and Altona was written by B. C. Roosen entitled Geschichte der Mennoniten-Gemeinde zu Hamburg und Altona (Hamburg, 1886-1887). More recent are R. Dollinger's Geschichte der Mennoniten in Schleswig-Holstein, Hamburg, und Lübeck (Neumünster i. H. 1930), and shorter contributions by Otto Schowalter in Kulturleistungen der Hamburger Mennoniten. Schiffahrt-Industrie-Welthandel, and Dr.

⁵⁶ See Dr. Karl Rembert's Zur Geschichte der Auswanderung Krefelder Mennoniten nach Nord-Amerika in Beiträge zur Geschichte rheinischer Mennoniten (1939). He lists additional literature on page 167.

He lists additional literature on page 167.

57 See also the American contribution by C. Henry Smith, The Mennonite Immigration to Pennsylvania in the Eighteenth Century (Norristown, Pa., 1929).

Ernst Crous in Der Beitrag der Mennoniten zum Wiederaufbau Deutschlands im Zeitalter des Dreissigjährigen Krieges (Mennonitische Geschichtsblätter, Nos. 1-2, 1938, 22-48). Additional literature in these fields can be found under the respective articles in ML and the Catalogus (331-334).

3. Biographies and Genealogies

Melchior Hofmann was the medium through which Anabaptism was spread from South Germany to the Low Countries. He expounded his teachings in a number of books. For these reasons considerable literature about him is available. Teylers Godgeleerd Genootschap awarded prizes for two biographies and published them. One was written by W. I. Leendertz entitled Melchior Hofmann (Haarlem, 1883), and the other by F. O. zur Linden entitled Melchior Hofmann, ein Prophet der Wiedertäufer (Haarlem, 1885). Samuel Cramer edited Melchior Hofmann's writings, adding a valuable introduction which was published in 1909 as volume V of BRN.

The literature on the Münsterite Anabaptists is readily accessible and will, therefore, be omitted here. The most recent treatments of this subject are Fritz Blanke's Das Reich der Wiedertäufer zu Münster 1534/35, and Walter Köhler's Das Täufertum in der neueren kirchenhistorischen Forschung (Archiv für Reformations-Geschichte, Heft 1, vol. 37, 1940, 13-37; 93-102). 59

The latest biography which lists all the literature by and about David Joris, who for a while lived and labored in The Netherlands, is written by Roland H. Bainton and entitled David Joris Wiedertäufer und Kämpfer für Toleranz im 16. Jahrhundert (Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte, Ergänzungsband VI, Leipzig, 1906).

Throughout the century of Mennonite historiography no other leader was the object of as many studies as Menno Simons. As mentioned previously, it was A. M. Cramer who pioneered in this field by presenting a thorough study, *Het leven en de verrichtingen van Menno Simons* (Amsterdam, 1837), on the

59 The promised continuations of these articles are seemingly unobtainable due to war conditions.

⁵⁸ See also H. Corsten, Rheinische Bibliographie, I (Köln, 1938), Nos. 6978-7044; and Christaan Sepp, Bibliotheek der Nederlandsche Kerkgeschiedschrijvers (Leiden, 1886), 397-399.

occasion of the three-hundredth anniversary of Menno Simons' conversion. Among those who made special contributions in this field we mention J. C. de Hoop Scheffer, 60 Samuel Cramer, 61 G. E. Frerichs, 62 and Karel Vos. The research work of the latter has been previously mentioned in connection with his controversy with W. Kühler concerning the origin of the Anabaptists. Karel Vos' book, Menno Simons, 1496-1561, Zijn leven en werken en zijne reformatorische denkbeelden (Leiden, 1914). is well documented and gives evidence that the author is the best authority on the sources in that field. However, Vos does not remain on that high level in interpreting and presenting the facts. His cold and rationalistic approach blinds him occasionally to the real forces at work and fails to create interest and enthusiasm for the man of whom he is writing. Two years later. John Horsch published Menno Simons, His Life, Labors and Teachings (Scottdale, 1916). Horsch's conservative Mennonite background enabled him in many instances to interpret Menno Simons more accurately than Vos did, even though he could not master the sources as well as Vos, who was a native of the country of Menno Simons and a born archivist. Occasionally it seems as though Vos finds secret pleasure in ridiculing Menno Simons' beliefs and teachings while Horsch's interpretations of them are sometimes of a defensive nature.

In 1848 two German biographies of Menno Simons were published. B. C. Roosen wrote Menno Simons den evangelischen Mennoniten-Gemeinden geschildert (Leipzig, 1848) and C. Harder, Das Leben Menno Symons (Königsberg, 1846). On the four-hundredth anniversary of the conversion of Menno Simons, Cornelius Krahn presented his study, Menno Simons (1496-1561), Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte und Theologie der Taufgesinnten (Karlsruhe i. B., 1936). The first part is a biography of Menno Simons and the second an interpretation of the theology of Menno Simons and the Anabaptists as compared with that of the reformers of the sixteenth century. Recent American brief biographies are Menno Simons, Apostle of the Nonresistant Life (Berne), by C. Henry Smith, and Menno

⁶⁰ See especially Eenige opmerkingen en mededeelingen betr. Menno Simons, DB, 1863, 1865, 1872, 1881, 1889, 1890, 1892, 1894.

⁶¹ Menno Simons, RE3.

⁶² Menno's taal, DB, 1905. Menno's verblijf in de eerste jaaren na zijn uitgang, DB, 1966.

⁶³ This book contains a list of writings by and about Menno Simons complete to 1936.

Simons' Life and Writings (Scottdale, 1936), by Harold S. Bender and John Horsch. In this connection, De portretten van Menno Simons (Met 12 afbeeldingen), (DB, Leiden, 1916) by G. I. Boekenoogen should be mentioned. A scholarly edition of the original writings of Menno Simons has not vet been published.

The writings of Obbe Philips, 64 Dirk Philips, 65 and Adam Pastor⁶⁶ have been edited by S. Cramer and F. Pijper who wrote introductions which contain the best available information concerning their lives. Complete biographies of these and other co-workers of Menno Simons have not vet been written.

More than thirty biographies, partly illustrated, of the great Mennonite leaders of the first century are given in the second and third volumes of Schvn-Maatschoen's previously mentioned history of the Mennonites. K. de Wit published thirty illustrations of leading men in Verzaamelingen van de afbeeldingen van veele voornaame mannen en leeraaren (Amsterdam, MDCCXLIII). Each illustration was accompanied by a short poem written by J. van den Vondel, Adr. Spinniker, and others.

The most easily accessible biographies of all significant leaders and other influential men can be found in the ML as far as it has been published. Literature by and about the early Anabaptist leaders is listed in Catalogus, 61-97, for the later period 155, 156, 297-303. Genealogies can be found in the Catalogus, 44-48. Kurt Kauenhowen published a bibliography in this field about those Mennonites who left the Netherlands and settled in Prussia. It is entitled Das Schrifttum zur Sippenkunde und Geschichte der taufgesinnten niederlandischen Einwanderer (Mennoniten) in Altpreussen und ihrer Abzweigungen.67

Characteristics and Principles

We shall not attempt to mention all of the literature which deals with Mennonite tenets, beliefs, teachings, and principles. We will merely name a few outstanding titles of the past and

⁶⁴ By S. Cramer in BRN, VII (1910).
65 By F. Pijper in BRN, X (1914).
66 By S. Cramer in BRN, A. H. Newman wrote "Adam Pastor, Antitrinitarian Antipaedobaptist," in Papers of the American Society of Church History, V. 1917.
67 Mitteilungen der Niederländischen Ahnengemeinschaft e. V., (Hamburg, 1939),

I, 66-109.

present centuries. Professor J. H. Scholten's De Leer der Hervormde Kerk, in which he characterized the Anabaptists, caused D. S. Gorter's Onderzoek naar het kenmerkend beginsel der Nederlandsche Doopsgezinden (1850), and S. Hoekstra's Nog iets over het eigenlijke wezen van den Doopsgezinden Christen (1851). All this was just a prelude to the most significant work written on this subject by a Dutch theologian. This was Beginselen en leer der oude Doopsgezinden, vergeleken met de overige Protestanten (Amsterdam, 1863), by Syste Hoekstra Bz. 68 who was professor at the Mennonite Theological Seminary and the University of Amsterdam. Hoekstra, one of the greatest Dutch philosophers and theologians of his century and a writer of numerous books in systematic theology, made a thorough comparative study of the Mennonite and other Protestant teachings and principles. Other Dutch Mennonite scholars may have had better mastery of the sources, but it is doubtful if any had a keener insight into the essentials of Mennonitism. It is regrettable that this standard work, which is not out-dated even at the present time, has found so little consideration not only abroad but also among European scholars. As Luther's theological concern centers around the sola fide, and Calvin's around the sovereignty and will of God, so does the Anabaptist, according to Hoekstra, center in the New Testament ecclesia. Contrary to this interpretation of the essentials of Anabaptism, Kühler, in his previously mentioned history of the Dutch Mennonites, constructs the theory that the genuine Anabaptism is that of individual piety which throughout Mennonite history struggles with the strictly supervised and disciplined ecclesia. According to Kühler, therefore, the martyrs, the Waterlanders, and other liberal factions represent genuine Anabaptism, while the strict and conservative followers of Menno Simons have deviated Thus the liberal "Doopsgezinde" religious beliefs of the nineteenth century are conjectured into the sixteenth century Anabaptism.

We shall not here attempt to present the interpretations of the essential principles of Anabaptism as they are given by the well known historians, Albrecht Ritschl, Ludwig Keller, Karl Holl, Ernst Troeltsch, Max Weber, Walter Köhler, and others. We will merely mention a few significant recent publications in this field. An outstanding treatise is Ethelbert Stauffer's

⁶⁸ For his biography, his writings, and literature on him see ML, II, 323-325.

"Märtyrertheologie und Täuferbewegung." 69 According to this work, the outstanding characteristic of Anabaptism is willingness to suffer for the Lord. The martyrs went through a threefold baptism—with the spirit, with the water, and with the blood. The willingness to suffer, which the Dutch call "lijdzaamheid," finds expression in the principle of nonresistance. How this principle was given up by the Dutch Mennonites is described by S. Cramer in "Hoe een van onze vroegere kenmerken is te niet gegaan" (DB, Leiden, 1898), and by Vos in De weerloosheid der Doopsgezinden (Amsterdam, 1916). The latest Dutch study of this field was made by N. van der Zijpp in De vroegere Doopsgezinden en de krijgsdienst (Wolvega, 1930). The most thorough study based on Dutch sources is Die Wehrfreiheit der alt preussischen Mennoniten (Marienburg, 1863) by W. Mannhardt. An English survey was made by John Horsch entitled The Principle of Nonresistance as Held by the Mennonite Church (Second ed., Scottdale, Pa., 1939).70

The most detailed Dutch account of the development of modes of baptism was given by I. G. de Hoop-Scheffer in his Oversicht der Geschiedenis van den Doop bij Onderdompeling." Karel Vos wrote "De doop bij overstorting" (DB, Leiden, 1911). Baptism by immersion was not entirely unknown among the early Anabaptists; however, the prevalent mode was sprinkling or pouring. Due to the influence of the Socinians, Baptists, and others, some churches adopted baptism by immersion. 72

Menno Simons and his followers shared a peculiar conception of the incarnation of Christ held by Melchior Hofmann. The author's discourse on Der Gemeindebegriff Mennos im Zusammenhang mit seiner Lehre von der Menschwerdung Christi⁷³ attempts to point out the connection between this doctrine and their conception of a church "without spot and wrinkle." Irvin E. Burkhart wrote "Menno Simons on the Incarnation" (MOR, April and July, 1930, April, 1932).

Regarding the Mennonite principle of nonconformity, a few titles deserve special mention. P. Langendijk gives an ac-

⁶⁹ Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte, XV (1933), 545-598.

⁷⁰ For further literature on nonresistance and the oath see Catalogus, 181, 184, 185, 303-305; and ML, I, 706-713.

⁷¹ Verslagen en Mededeedlingen der Koninklijke Academie van Wetenschappen, Afd. Letterkunde, 2. reeks, dl. XII, (Amsterdam, 1883). 72 Further literature: Cat., 174-181, 303-304.

⁷³ op. cit. 155-161; additional literature, Cat., 181-184.

count of the complaints of the Swiss Mennonites who settled in The Netherlands, about the worldliness of their Dutch brethren. C. N. Wybrands portrays the cultural and ethical standards of past conservatism of the Dutch Mennonites in *Het Menniste Zusje* (Amsterdam, 1913).

The above-mentioned willingness to suffer and the principles of nonconformity and nonresistance found an interpretation in the work of Adolf Ehrt, a student of M. Weber and E. Troeltsch. In his Wesen des Mennonitentums⁷⁵ he makes keen observations regarding the essence of the Anabaptist ecclesia and the Anabaptist attitude toward the society in which His analyses, however, fall short because of too consistent generalizations and his failure to see the aggressive spirit of the church of the martyrs. Fritz Heyer attempts to give a "dogmengeschichtliche Zusammenfassung" of the sects of the Reformation in Der Kirchenbegriff der Schwärmer (Leipzig, 1939), and Ulrich Bergfried wrote a dissertation under Karl Heim entitled Verantwortung als theologisches Problem im Täufertum des 16. Jahrhunderts (Wuppertal-Elberfeld, 1938). Two American interpreters of Dutch Anabaptism are Henry Elias Dosker and John Horsch. Most outstanding among their publications are The Dutch Anabaptists (Philadelphia, 1921), and Mennonites in Europe (Scottdale, 1942), respectively.

5. Worship, Devotion, and Literature

In no other country do the Mennonites have such a wealth of literature in the fields of worship, devotion, confessions of faith, and religious education. Also in no other country have they taken as active a part in the cultural, economic, and political activities of the nation. For example, writers and painters of renown, like Carel van Mander, Joost van den Vondel, Jan Luyken, Pieter Langendijk, and even Rembrandt are listed among them. The article, "Die Mennoniten in der holländischen Literatur" (ML, II, 669-672) by H. F. W. Jeltes, lists the writ-

⁷⁴ De Zwitsere Eenvoudigheid, klagende over de bedorvene Zeden veeler Hollandse Doopsgezinden. (Haarlem, 1713); see Cat., 189.

⁷⁵ Das Mennonitentum in Russland von seiner Einwanderung bis zur Gegenwart (Berlin-Leipzig, 1932).

⁷⁶ Because of war conditions, these books were not available but detailed reviews appeared in Mennonitische Geschichtsblütter by W. Köhler and Chr. Neff (August, 1940, 10-19, 48-52).

ings on and by Dutch Mennonites and gives a bibliography in this field."

In spite of the abundance of literature in the above-mentioned fields, little has been done to treat the different subjects in a historical and systematic manner. Since much of this literature, in its German and English translations, has influenced American Mennonitism, it offers an unexplored field for research for the American student of Anabaptistica. However, the work has been started. Robert Friedmann wrote an article on the "Dutch Mennonite Devotional Literature from Peter Peters to Johannes Deknatel, 1625-1753" (MOR, July, 1941). and another on "Mennonite Prayer Books, Their Story and Their Meaning" (MQR, October, 1943), Walter H. Hohmann has paved the way for a more exhaustive study of Mennonite hymnology in his Outlines in Hymnology with Emphasis on Mennonite Hymnology (North Newton, 1941). S. Cramer made thorough studies in this field which were published in DB (1900, 1902). The article on "Gesangbücher" in ML, and R. Wolkan's Die Lieder der Wiedertäufer (Berlin, 1903), should be mentioned in this connection.⁷⁸

F. S. Knipscheer wrote an exhaustive study concerning the controversy on silent and audible prayer in "Geschiedenis van het stil en het stimmelijk gebed bij de Nederlandsche Doopsgezinden (DB, 1897, 1898)." In "Reizen naar de Eeuwigheid" (DB, 1896), J. J. Honig Jz. makes a study of one of the most popular devotional books entitled Wegh nae Vredenstadt (1625) by Pieter Pietersz. Books in the field of devotion and theology are listed in Catalogus, 212-239, 306-310. Sermons are found on 239-256, 310-324. The extensive literature in the field of religious education is given on the pages 256-265, 324-329.

The Dutch Mennonites had their own Bible translations. S. Müller wrote on this subject in *Het onstaan en het gebruik van Bijbelvertalingen onder de Nederlandsche Doopsgezinden.*80 Also the articles "Bibelübersetzungen" and "Biestkens-Bibel" in *ML* give valuable information concerning the Bible translations which were used by the Anabaptists. Pieter Jansz Twisk, one of the most prolific Mennonite writers of the seventeenth century, wrote a Bible concordance entitled *Concordantie der*

78 Catalogus, 265-279, 329-331.

79 Catalogus, 188.

⁷⁷ An English translation appeared in MQR, April, 1937, 142-155.

⁸⁰ In Jaarboekje voor Doopsgezinde gemeenten (1837).

Heyligher Schriftvren enz. (Hoorn, 1615), which was generally used. He added a second volume, Bybelsch Naem-ende Chronyck-boeck (Hoorn, 1632). Let us conclude by mentioning a field in which very little work has been done. We refer to the Dutch confessions of faith which are listed in Catalogus, 168-173, 353 (see also "Bekenntnisse des Glaubens" in ML, I, 157-161).

CONCLUSION

We have seen that the Dutch Mennonites have been most consistent in establishing a church "without spot or wrinkle." They practiced the principle of nonconformity to "the world" more rigidly than any other Mennonite church. They wrote more on this subject and produced more literature in the fields of devotion, worship, confessions of faith, and theology than any other Mennonite church. They were the first to overcome the divisions which resulted from their concept of a church "of saints." They were the first among the Mennonites to live in a country of religious freedom and to share the nation's blessings during its Golden Age. This sharing in cultural values and the consequent secularization also produced a wealth of literature. The Dutch Mennonites were the first to do relief work on a big scale among their suffering brethren.

American Mennonitism is now beginning to analyze its tenets, doctrines, and heritage. In doing so it has turned first to its Swiss background. This is justified because the Swiss Mennonites were the first to settle in this country and their descendants form the majority of the Mennonites in America. But in the future of the American Mennonite research more attention will have to be given to Dutch Mennonitism. In the first place, the sources of Swiss Mennonite literature on which research is based are limited, in comparison to Dutch Mennonite Secondly, the latter has influenced the Mennonites of Switzerland and those of Swiss background more than their own. Thirdly, Dutch Mennonitism faced problems and made developments some one hundred and more years ago which American Mennonitism faces today and will face tomorrow. These problems and their solutions are reflected in Dutch Mennonite literature and in the Dutch Mennonite churches of today. A study and knowledge of these problems and their solutions

may help American Mennonitism to solve its present and future problems.

The purpose of this paper is to call attention to the wealth of Dutch source material, which is essential to any study of Anabaptism, and to furnish a guide to the same.

IV. GENERAL SOURCES OF Anabaptistica Neerlandica

1. Libraries and Archives

The most complete collection of books and documents on Anabaptistica is to be found in the library and archives of the Mennonite Church of Amsterdam, Holland. Smaller collections are located in the libraries of the universities of Amsterdam, Leyden, Groningen, and Kiel, the Koninglijke Bibliotheek at The Hague, the British Museum, and certain church and private libraries among the Mennonites of The Netherlands and Germany.

The collections of Dutch Mennonitica in America are rather scarce. Special efforts are being made to preserve and collect everything in connection with the history of the Mennonites, including the Dutch, by the Mennonite historical societies and libraries of Bethel College, North Newton, Kansas; Goshen College, Goshen, Indiana; Bluffton College, Bluffton, Ohio; Mennonite Publishing House, Scottdale, Pa.; and Tabor College, Hillsboro, Kansas. A number of other college, university, and theological seminary libraries in the United States have some material along this line, particularly Union Theological Seminary, New York; Colgate-Rochester Divinity School, Rochester, N. Y., and Crozer Theological Seminary, Chester, Pa.

2. Bibliographies and Catalogs

(J. G. Boekenogen), Catalogus der werken over de Doopsgezinden en hunne geschiedenis aanwezig in de bibliotheek der Vereenigde Doopsgezinde Gemeente te Amsterdam (Amsterdam, 1919). Quoted in this paper: Catalogus.

Roland H. Bainton, Bibliography of the Continental Reformation, (Chicago, 1935).

Harold S. Bender, "Recent Progress in Research in Anabaptist History," MQR, VIII (1934), 3-17.

Fritz Blanke, "Das Reich der Wiedertäufer zu Münster 1534/35" (Archiv für Reformations-Geschichte, Heft I, vol. 37 1940).

H. Corsten, Rheinische Bibliographie, (Köln, 1938), I, Nos. 6978-7044.

Chr. Hege, "Geschichtsschreibung" in Mennonitisches Lexikon, II, 97-98.

H. F. W. Jeltes, "Die Mennoniten in der holländischen Literatur" in ML, II, 669-672. English translation in MQR, April, 1937, 142-155.

(John Horsch), Catalogue of the Mennonite Historical Library in Scottdale, Pennsylvania (Scottdale, Pa., 1929).

Katalog der Kirchenbibliothek der Mennonitengemeinde zu Danzig (Danzig, 1869).

Kurt Kauenhowen, Das Schrifttum zur Sippenkunde und Geschichte der taufgesinnten niederländischen Einwanderer (Mennoniten) in Altpreussen und ihrer Abzweigungen (Vol. I of Mitteilungen der Niederländischen Ahnengemeinschaft e. V., Hamburg, 1939).

Walter Köhler, "Das Täufertum in der neueren kirchengeschichtlichen Forschung: I. Allgemeines" (Archiv für Reformations-Geschichte, Heft 1, XXXVII, 1940). Was to be continued.

Cornelius Krahn, Menno Simons. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte und Theologie der Taufgesinnten (Karlsruhe, 1936), 9-12, 181-189.

W. Nijhoff en M. E. Kronenberg, Nederlandsche Bibliographie van 1500-1540 (Den Haag, 1923).

Wilhelm Pauck, "The Historiography of the German Reformation During the Past Twenty Years" (*Church History*, IX, December, 1940), 335-340.

J. G. de Hoop Scheffer, Inventaris der Archiefstukken berustende bij de Vereenigde Doopsgezinde Gemeente te Amsterdam (Amsterdam, 1883-84).

Karl Schottenloher, Bibliographie zur deutschen Geschichte im Zeitalter der Glaubensspaltung 1517-1585 (Leipzig, 1933-39), 5 vols.

H. van der Smissen, Katalog von der Bibliothek der Mennoniten Gemeinde zu Hamburg und Altona (Altona, 1890). Chr. Sepp, Bibliothek der Nederlandsche Kerkgeschiedschrijvers (Leyden, 1886).

E. Teufel, "Täufertum und Quäkertum im Lichte der neueren Forschung I." (*Theologische Rundschau, Neue Folge*, 13. Jhrg., 1941, Heft 1/2, 21-28).

3. Editions, Encyclopedias, and Periodicals.

Most of the periodicals can be found in the *Union List of Serials in Libraries of the United States and Canada* and are therefore accessible.

Acta der Provinciale en Particuliere Synoden (I-VII, 1892-1898). Edited by Reitsma and Van Veen.

Archief voor Kerkelijke Geschiedenis (Leyden, 1829-1849).

Bibliotheca Reformatoria Neerlandica. Edited by S. Cramer and F. Pijper. (The Hague, 1904-1912, 10 volumes). Abbreviated: BRN.

Bijdragen tot eene Nederlandsche Bibliographie (Amsterdam, 1884-1931).

Biographisch Woordenboek van Protestantsche Godgeleerden in Nederland. Edited by J. P. de Bie and Loosjes (The Hague). Corpus documentorum inquisitionis haereticae pravitatis Neerlandicae. Edited by Julius Fredericq (Gent, 1889-1906, 5 volumes.)

Doopsgezinde Bijdragen, (Leyden, 1861-1919). Abbreviated: DB.

Doopsgezinde Bijdragen. Register op de vijftig eerste jaargangen daarvan, 1861-1910; benevens op S. Muller, Jaarboekje, 1837-1850; en D. S. Gorter, Godsdienstige lectuur voor Doopsgezinden, 1854-1858 (Leyden, 1912).

Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart. Edited by Schiele and Zscharnack (Tübingen, 1912, first edition). See also the later edition.

Geschriftjes ten behoeve van de Doopsgezinden in de verstrooiing. (Amsterdam, Nos. 1-60).

Gids (Amsterdam, 1837+).

Godgeleerde Bijdragen (Amsterdam, Leyden, 1827-1879). Godsdienstige lectuur voor Doopsgesinden. Edited by D. S. Gorter (Sneek, 1854-1858).

Historisch Genootschap te Utrecht. Berigten, (1846-1863). Historisch Genootschap te Utrecht. Bijdragen en Mededelingen, (1877+).

Jaarboekje voor de Doopsgezinde gemeenten in de Nederlanden. Edited by S. Muller. (Amsterdam, 1837-1850).

Maatschappij der Nederlandsche Letterkunde te Leiden. Levensberichten, (1864+). For further publications see Union List of Serials.

Mennonitische Blätter (Danzig, 1854+).

Mennonitische Geschichtsblätter (Weierhof, 1936+).

Mennonitisches Lexikon. Edited by Chr. Hege and Chr. Neff (Frankfurt a. M. and Weierhof, 1913+). Complete from A-M. Abbreviated: ML.

Mennonite Quarterly Review (Goshen, Ind., 1927+). Abbreviated: MQR.

Nederlandsche Bibliographie (Leyden, Utrecht, 1912+).

Nieuw Theologisch Tijdschrift (Haarlem, 1912+).

Realencyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche. Edited by Hauck-Herzog, (Leipzig, 1898-1906). See also the second and third edition.

Schriftenreihe des Mennonitischen Geschichtsvereins, (Weierhof, 1938+).

Theologisch Tijdschrift (Amsterdam, Leyden, 1867-1919).

Zondagsbode. Doopsgezind Weekblad (1887+).

CHURCH AND STATE IN PROTESTANT GERMANY BEFORE 1918

WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO PRUSSIA

Andrew Landale Drummond Alva, Scotland

In the castle of Coburg there is a singular emblematic fresco of the seventeenth century. It depicts the wedding procession of Duke John Casimir, which is led by knights, falconers, and musicians. Then, drawn by the nuptial car, defile two sets of attendants—four councillors for civil affairs and three for ecclesiastical. So the Duke sets forth for Cythera, the isle of Venus. Here is a graphic symbol of the twin bureaucracy at the service of every German prince.¹ The principle of cujus regio, ejus religio inevitably made pleasure, convenience, and power the motive of administration, sacred as well as secular.

"I see in the future," said Melanchthon, "a tyranny more intolerant than ever existed before." The Austrian core of the Empire was no static lump of Roman Catholicism, but a fertile source of Jesuit propaganda for the conversion of South Germany² and the detachment of princely houses previously associated with the Reformation,³ e. g., Electoral Saxony and the Rhenish Palatinate. Evangelicalism suffered far more than Romanism through Germany being a mosaic of small states; the curse of Lutherland was *Kleinstaaterei*⁴ and the Erastianism which was its corollary.

The "territorial system" was a makeshift polity devised to

^{1 &}quot;Not a few of the new-religionist princes . . . set the people the worst possible example. From their daily overloaded tables, from their state apartments hung with indecent pictures, went forth the Church ordinances, the suspensions of preachers . . . yea, even the death sentences, issued against those who did not think exactly as they did concerning faith and justification." (Johann Janssen, History of the Garman People, XVI, 2f.)

² In 1557, the papal ambassador at the Imperial court estimated that in greater Germany seven-tenths were Lutherans, two-tenths Reformed and only one-tenth Catholic.

³ W. C. Dowding, German Theology during the Thirty Years' War: The Life and Correspondence of George Calixtus (Oxford, 1863).

⁴ James Bryce, Holy Roman Empire (London, 1880). At the Reformation there were 7 electors (Kurfürsten), 50 prelates, 70 abbots and abbesses, 31 secular princes, 128 counts, 81 free cities. As late as 1750 there were 350 princely houses in the Empire.

take the place of an Evangelical Church of Germany. Luther's painful experience convinced him that the jus episcopale belonged, in the last resort, to the civil authorities, who "took over" in principalities and free cities after the Diet of Spires (1526). Principal Lindsay has described the new system as an ad hoc structure suggested by the consistorial courts through which mediaeval bishops transacted diocesan business.6 The term "Superintendent" was taken over from the later Scholastics, who had used it as a translation of episkopos. Prince John of Saxony, the first to improvise the new polity (1527), made it clear that his superintendents were not to be bishops in the Catholic sense. He assumed the title of summus episcopus and as "High Magistrate" appointed a supreme ecclesiastical council, consisting of jurists, civil servants, and theologians. He nominated a "General Superintendent" to preside over the Council and "Superintendents" to administer the dioceses. The hierarchical principle was retained, but many administrative functions were transferred to the state. This provided a pattern for other principalities, which left room for local modifications.

Had Luther been as gifted an organizer as a leader of revolt, he might have laid the foundations of a church polity suited to the exigency of the times, yet capable of expansion in dependence on the Word of God, working within an ecclesiastical organism. Unfortunately, he allowed his faith in the priesthood of all believers to be over-ridden by his distrust of "the common man." Even when the Landgrave of Hesse was ready to adopt Francis Lambert's democratic church constitution based on New Testament precedent, Luther dissented. He could not conserve, any more than he could construct. He clung to the torso of his "German Mass," but made no attempt to retain the episcopal constitution inherited from the Middle Ages, which

⁵ See Herzog's Real Encyklopädie für prot. Theologie (3rd ed.), articles such as "Kirchenregiment," "Kirchenordnung," "Territorial-system." Also, New Schaff-Herzog Cyclopaedia of Religious Knowledge (New York, 1908); Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart. K. D. Macmillan, Protestantism in Germany (Princeton, 1917) deals mainly with relations between church and state from the sixteenth to the nineteenth centuries; it has a good bibliography.

⁶ T. M. Lindsay, History of the Reformation (1906), I, chap. VI.

⁷ Richter collected 172 separate ecclesiastical constitutions (Die ev. Kirchenordnungen des 16. Jahrhunderts (Weimar, 1846). Sehling published a complete collection, with the same title (Leipzig, 1902).

⁸ R. L. Winters, Francis Lambert of Avignon (Philadelphia, 1938).

⁹ Some liturgiologists have rated this highly and have blamed Pietism and Rationslism for its disintegration (Graff, Geschichte der Auflösung der alten gottesdienstlichen Formen).

might have safeguarded to some extent the church's spiritual rights. In 1542 he consecrated Nicholas von Amsdorf as bishop of Naumburg, although several ex-Romanist bishops were available for ordination purposes. 10 The German prelates did not take the lead, like Cranmer and his associates, in determining the church's constitution.11

After Luther's death, the German princes tightened their grip on the territorial system. They ignored the democratic side of Luther's personality, while they paid lip-service to his principles. "What had been introduced as a necessity came to be gradually claimed as prescriptive right" (Kurz). They were jealous of any attempt to engraft synodical shoots on the tree of despotic territorialism. 12 Calvinism encouraged the layman to think for himself and to claim his rights in church government; this was stigmatised as foreign (undeutsch). The princes proclaimed it their aim to preserve the "status religionis in Germania per Lutherum instauratus," and to watch over the "depositum Jesus Christi." In Saxony and elsewhere these princes secured the support of all kinds of "vested interests," including ultra-Lutherans who utilised state machinery for stamping out "Crypto-Calvinism." The persecution of the liberal Melanchthonian Lutherans merely increased the number of those who adopted Reformed principles. Hence the success of Calvinism in the Palatinate, Hesse, and other parts of Western Germany.¹³

EVOLUTION OF THE TERRITORIAL SYSTEM IN PRUSSIA

It is significant that in Brandenburg, one of the most uncompromising strongholds of Lutheran territorialism, the prince

10 The Swedish church retained "apostolic succession" more by undesigned circumstances than by conviction (J. L. Ainslie, Doctrines of Ministerial Order in the Reformed Churches [Edinburgh, 1940], 207.)
11 A. V. G. Allen, Christian Institutions, 253, 275f.

12 See general church histories, dealing mainly with Germany; J. H. Kurtz, Kirchengeschichte (English translation, London, 1893, II, III); Hermelink und Maurer, Reformation und Gegenreformation (1931); Horst Stephan, Neuzeit (Tübingen, 1909 and subsequent eds. [Handbuch der Kirchengeschichte, ed. G. Krüger]); Karl Müller, Kirchengeschichte, 2nd ed., 2 vols. (Tübingen, 1924).

13 The persecution of Calvinists was particularly sharp in Saxony, where the Chancellor was executed with a sword specially engraved "Beware, O Calvinist, Dr. Nicholas Krell." The Emperor Maximilian II interceded in vain with the Elector for Peucer, languishing in a dungeon. After Louis XIV had ravaged the Palatinate of the Rhine, the Jesuits remained; they tried to conciliate the Lutherans, but persecuted the Reformed so savagely that German Protestants appealed to the Emperor, Joseph I, who used his influence in the interest of toleration. See J. J. Good, Origin of the Reformed Church in Germany (Reading, Pa., 1887) and his History of the Reformed Church in Germany, 1620-1690 (1894).

took the lead in the cause of toleration. John Sigismund, having seen the beneficial effects of Calvinism in his travels, expressed his personal preference for the Reformed system. In spite of his clergy and his wife, he acted on the jus reformandi religionem and summoned Calvinistic divines from the Palatinate for consultation. He declared that he had no intention of coercing his people; he merely desired to give them "the opportunity of knowing Lutheranism purged of papacy." The Lutheran divines had almost to be dragged to the conference table to meet their sworn enemies. The Diet, which had a certain amount of power before the Thirty Years' War, refused to vote supplies. Sigismund, however, insisted on his own right to be a Calvinist and obtained full rights for his co-religionists (not generally acknowledged in Germany till the Treaty of Westphalia). The Elector's declaration that he would force no man's conscience. publicly or privately, was much in advance of his times (Confessio Sigismundi, 1614).

Frederick William, "the Great Elector" (1640-88), sought to make Lutherans and Calvinists agree to differ. To this end he forbade his subjects to study at Wittenberg, the headquarters of ultra-Lutheran fanaticism. Thanks to his constructive energy, Brandenburg, hitherto one of the poorest of German principalities, became strong and prosperous, an effective nucleus for the future Prussian state. It soon displaced Saxony in the moral leadership of Germany. The Great Elector twice refused the throne of Poland and had nothing but scorn for his fellowprinces who sought only their dynastic interests, in utter subservience to Louis XIV. While allowing Roman Catholics more liberty than any Protestant ruler of his age, he offered the exiled Huguenots full civil and religious rights, cultural freedom, and favorable opportunities in commerce, the army, and the state. He was wise enough to foresee the temporal and spiritual advantages that would accrue through the gradual assimilation of this fruitful minority.

His son, Frederick I, who assumed the title of King of Prussia in 1701, exercised his rights as *summus episcopus* in the officious manner afterwards so characteristic of his house. His Calvinistic principles prompted him to remove from Lutheran churches whatever he considered a "Catholic remnant"—

¹⁴ See Thomas Carlyle, Frederick the Great, I, for his predecessors; also, J. A. R. Marriett and C. G. Robertson, The Evolution of Prussia (Oxford, 1917).

private confession, exorcism, crosses, vestments, etc. On the other hand, he gave no encouragement to the self-governing instincts of the Calvinists. He irritated both confessions by dismissing doctrinal differences as matters of secondary importance; as a symbol of his ideals he built a number of new "union churches," on whose altar the Lutheran and the Heidelberg catechisms lay side by side. Ranging further afield, he saw in the English Prayer Book a centre for the union of Protestantism. He sent Grabe and Jablonski (a Moravian bishop) to meet Archbishop Sharp of York, with a view to union of the English and Prussian churches on an episcopal basis. Queen Anne was interested, but these negotiations broke down with the death of Frederick I.¹⁵

His successor, Frederick William I, had no interest in transforming frugal "superintendents" into lordly prelates. His sole interest was the welfare of the army and the drilling of his people in the principles of patriarchal loyalty, Spartan endurance, and traditional pietism. His reign was a transition period.¹⁶

Frederick II "the Great," who succeeded his father in 1740, was a militarist and a sceptic, but wisely progressive in his tolerance. He offered complete freedom to sects that were barely tolerated elsewhere—Mennonites, Socinians, etc. He even forbade the publication of a Bull drawn up by a progressive pope, dissolving the Jesuit Order, because he valued its educational work. "All religions are equally good," he maintained, "if only the people who profess them are honest; and if Turks and heathen came and were willing to populate the land, we would build mosques and temples. . . . False religious zeal is a tyrant that depopulates provinces; toleration is a kind mother that cherishes and advances their prosperity."

The Prussian "Land Law" of 1794 was the work of Frederick II, though published after his death. The section dealing with churches, their rights and obligations (II, XI), has been described as "the most perfect expression of the 'collegio-territorial' system then prevailing." The ideal of the period was enlightened despotism. The Landrecht allowed no religious society to exclude its members "for mere opinion deviating from the common confession of faith provided that there

¹⁵ J. W. Legg, English Church Life from the Restoration to the Tractarian Movement (London, 1914), 328, 382, 404f.

¹⁶ G. Pariset, L'état et les Eglises en Prusse sous Frederic-Guillaume (Paris, 1896), I.

was no occasion of scandal or interruption of worship." In all cases of dispute the state was to have the last word. This obviously cut across the principle of the church as a community united by a creed. Prussian administration of the Aufklärung period treated the pastor as a minor official charged with duties relating to elementary education and the intimation of secular edicts. The emphasis was all on utility, and this affected even preaching and worship. Hard utilitarianism "squeezed religion as dry as a lemon" (as Herder said) and drove imaginative people to mystical cults. Freemasonry flourished. Among those who dabbled in alchemy and magic was the Rosicrucian, Johann Wöllner. A poor tutor, he had married his patron's daughter and climbed the social ladder so skilfully that he succeeded in enmeshing the Crown Prince in a web of mystery and intrigue.

When Frederick William II succeeded Frederick II in 1786. he gave Wöllner carte blanche as head of the Ecclesiastical Department, so long as his favorite was willing to shelter the scandal of his private life. Wöllner, who was practically premier, had changed his views and declared war on the "enlighteners" (the modernists of that age). By the famous decree of July 9, 1788, pastors were ordered to preach according to the letter of the confessional standards: Biblical criticism (which had flourished since the middle of the century) was declared heretical: rigorous press censorship was imposed; Socinians and other rationalistic sects were prohibited; academic and ecclesiastical appointments were closely regulated. This order was issued by royal decree without any attempt to consult the clergy. Even those who had no sympathy with rationalism were struck by "the crying contrast between the austerity of the Edict (pedantic, unctious in tone) and the immorality of the prince whose name it bore." The commission that was appointed to enforce the law was driven from Halle by the students. The King blamed Wöllner for his failure and even deprived him of his secular appointments in 1794, so that he might have more time "to devote himself to the things of God." Recalls to religion, backed by threats, continued to emanate from the throne to the end of the reign. Had the King waited for the reaction due to the excess of the French Revolution, public opinion might easily have swung round in his favor. Prussia's share of the second partition of Poland did not compensate for defeat by the French

¹⁷ Spalding, On the Usefulness of the Ministerial Office in the Country.

Republic; isolation led inevitably to her humiliation by Napoleon in 1806.

The accession of Frederick William III in 1797 did not see the end of what Hans von Schubert has called "that deplorable growth, a Court theology." The new king had "all the Hohenzollern tenacity of personal power without the Hohenzollern genius for using it." His evil genius was the sycophant Altenstein, who kept reminding His Majesty that he was "the determinate instrument of Providence." Frederick II's Landrecht, "the first law book since the Reformation to recognize in a large way the ecclesiastical freedom of congregations and individuals," (Förster) was rendered ineffectual by the royal decree of 1808; ecclesiastical affairs were transferred to the Minister of the Interior, so that the church practically ceased to be an independent organism. Altenstein, like Laud, played on the monarch's fear that representative institutions did not agree with the divine right of kings, in church as in state. Frederick William III, finding the popular demand for a constitution inconvenient after 1815, tried to capitalize the nationalism and mediaevalism produced by the Romantic movement. Anything that was "alt-Deutsch" was at a premium—Gothic architecture, remnants of the "German Mass" that his ancestors had expunged from the Liturgy, old-world ceremonial, etc. One of his impulses was to proclaim his superintendents bishops, himself designing their silk gowns and crosses. Then he remembered that "father Luther" had his doubts of episcopacy and went on no further with the scheme.

Baron Bunsen considered that the King's visit to London in 1814 gave him an impression of the English Church as "imposing, national, conservative"; which suggested the ideal of one Prussian Church with a dignified hierarchy and liturgy. There was certainly a wide-spread conviction that the flood of pietism and rationalism in the eighteenth century had submerged the confessional landmarks of Lutheranism and Calvinism. The Tercentenary of the Reformation was due in 1817. Here was an opportunity of turning evanescent enthusiasm into permanent results. Frederick William III amalgamated the two state churches into the "United Evangelical Church of Prussia"; as

¹⁸ Encyclopedia Britannica (11th ed.), article "Frederick William III"; E. Forster, an apologist for the territorial system, in Die Enstehung der preuss. Landeskirche . . . Friedrich Wilhelms III (Tübingen, 1905).

a personal gesture he, with his Reformed family traditions, partook of communion in the Lutheran church at Potsdam, finally healing the eucharistic dispute of 1529. The administration of Prussia being as it was, practically an absolute monarchy, no one could have carried through the Union but the King. His good intentions were generally recognized. It was his subsequent high-handedness that roused antagonism—witness his rigorous persecution of the "Old Lutheran" minority that followed Claus Harms, who published Ninety-five Theses in imitation of Luther, whose name disappeared in the title of the new body. 19 Frederick William III made the further mistake of imposing a new liturgy on the United Church (1822). He fancied himself a liturgiologist. He dismissed all protests as "idle chatter," and made it clear that preferment would depend on passive obedience. In the biographies of Schleiermacher by Schenkel (1868) and by Dilthey (1870) we read that he and a dozen of the Berlin clergy criticised the new Agende as "defective in literary style and not in harmony with evangelical freedom." They respectfully petitioned the King, who treated their appeal as "criminal obstinacy." Altenstein advised an action in the courts, but feared acquittal. After the case had dragged on for a year, the pastors were informed by the government that "they must behave better in future." Schleiermacher stood fast and eventually secured what he had requested—an alternative liturgy (1829). Practical experience had borne out his denunciations of Erastianism in his Addresses (Reden, 1799). Territorialism, instead of hallowing the state, secularized the church; it made it profitable for "the proud, the ambitious and the intriguing" to enter the holy place, "where otherwise they would have felt only the bitterest ennui." Whenever state patronage appears in the spiritual realm, "like the head of Medusa—everything turns to stone."

The Union of 1817 was a curious doctrinal evasion, the Augsburg Confession and Heidelberg Catechism being accepted "so far as they are in agreement with each other." It was naturally supported by the liberal school of Schleiermacher, by broad

¹⁹ Pastor Scheibel of Breslau was suspended for refusing to conform. On comparing the King to Antiochus Epiphanes, he had to flee the country. In spite of the mediation of the Crown Prince, his followers were persecuted. Thus the King converted a firebrand into a hero. Whole congregations emigrated. As late as 1839 Pastor Grabau sailed with 1000 adherents and organized "The Synod of Exiles" at Buffalo, N. Y. Not till 1845 was belated recognition granted to the "Old Lutherans" of Frussia. They numbered only 51,600 members in 1905.

Evangelicals like Tholuck, and by eclectics like Nitsch. The transference of the Rhineland principalities to Prussia in 1815 had brought into the United Church a strong Reformed element, used to the working of representative synods. The conservative supporters of the Union included rigid Evangelicals like Hengstenberg, Biblical commentator and religious journalist; they linked up with reactionary jurists like Stahl and the aristocratic von Gerlachs in opposition to all liberal movements in church and state. Die-hard Confessional Lutherans like Löhe, intent on resuscitating sixteenth century Confessional Lutheranism and mediaeval ceremonial, and realizing that they were not strong enough to dominate the United Church, endeavored to relax the bonds of Union so as to produce federation rather than fusion.

The Prussian United Church weathered the Revolution of 1848 and the reaction that followed.21 It was protected by Frederick William IV, who ascended the throne in 1848. new King was a curious enthusiast—a mediaevalist in his love of old-world ritual and color, vet one of the founders of the World's Evangelical Alliance; a monarch who had yearnings after "apostolic succession" and yet clung to Lutheran traditions as regards the priesthood of all believers. Indeed, Professor Geffcken went so far as to credit him with the intention of "renouncing the episcopal powers of the sovereign and resigning church supremacy into the proper hands."22 Far from holding Hegel's theory that the church was merely the "inner side" of the state, he earnestly desired to restore the spiritual independence of the Body of Christ. The territorial system was responsible for the impotence of German Evangelicalism against the inroads of Romanism. It would be a glorious day for the Fatherland if the German Church of the Gospel were to stand on her own feet—and not on the feet of forty petty princes—"nolo epis-copari!" That day never came. His "apostasy" from the traditions of his Hohenzollern forefathers never materialized.

²⁰ Most German states followed the example of Prussia in Church Union after 1817. There was no Union where the Reformed were numerically negligible, e. g., Hanover, Mecklenburg, Saxony and Bavaria.

²¹ Kahnis, Internal History of German Protestantism (Edinburgh, 1856); G. Ecke, Die ev. Landeskirchen Deutschlands im 19. Jahrhundert (Berlin, 1903); R. Seeberg, Die Kirche Deutschlands im 19. Jahrhundert (Leipzig, 1903).

²² H. Geffcken, Church and State (London, 1877), II, 182-86. Hhe wrote "with the King's essays before him in their integrity." Richter made copious extracts in his Kaiser Friedrich-Wilhelm IV und die Verfassung der ev. Kirche (Berlin, 1861).

dramatic inauguration of the new spiritual order was planned; ecclesiastical authority was to be publicly transferred to a liberated church, in the presence of the archbishops of Canterbury and Upsala. Alas! this impressive scene never took place. Both progressives and conservatives realized that the King was a visionary, not a man of action. As a Lutheran, he was not a whole-hearted believer in thoroughgoing episcopacy of the English type: in spite of the Reformed traditions of his House, he was afraid of Presbyterian tendencies that suggested the bogy of constitutionalism and democracy.

Baron Bunsen had encouraged the King in his ideals of liturgical reform and antiquarian ecclesiology, but his practical sympathy was with those who aimed at "a Free Church in a Free State." Like Schleiermacher, he was appreciative of the achievements of Voluntaryism in America. He had already determined to his own satisfaction the constitution of *The Church of the Future*.²³ The Revolution of 1848 offered a speedier (and less sacrificial) means of achieving a free church than the disruption had already shown in Scotland (1843).

The first German Parliament met in St. Paul's Church, Frankfurt, to draw up a Constitution (1848). Karl von Hase, the liberal historian, presented to the deputies a design for "The Evangelical Church of the German Reich," ready even to the very house where the Imperial Synod was to meet. The "People's Church" was to be entirely free from the state; lay patronage was to be abolished and rightful ecclesiastical property was to be secure. The Frankfurt Parliament claimed to regenerate Germany, but refused to open its sessions with prayer, even though they were held in a church! The professors and journalists failed utterly. Doctrinaire dreams melted into air when the Revolution was crushed. Political reaction and religious obscurantism were more closely allied than ever. William IV's theocratic visions were shattered and the status quo restored. Evangelical Prussia had to accept the hegemony of ultramontane Austria.24

During the reign of William, first German Emperor, who

23 A. L. Drummond, "Baron Bunsen, Pioneer of Pan-Protestantism" (Evangelical Quarterly, January, 141).

²⁴ The recovery of Romanism is well described in G. Goyau, L'Allemagne religieuse: le Catholicisme 1800-48 (Paris, 1897, 1905). Not even Prussia, rejuvenated and led by Bismarck, was successful in the Kulturkampf (1873-6). State encouragement of the "Old Catholics" detached a mere fragment from Romanism.

became King of Prussia in 1861, a series of administrative church reforms were carried through to meet the needs of the Congregations were grouped into church councils resembling presbyteries and synods, on an ascending scale. The most passive Lutheran areas of East Prussia had now the opportunity of being trained in self-government. The Church Constitution of 1876 was "representative" rather than Presbyterian, for the laymen chosen to sit in church councils were delegates, elected on a population basis, rather than elders who had been solemnly ordained in their respective congregations: this "democratic" basis was carried to secular extremes in the "advanced" ecclesiastical constitution of Baden. In Prussia the elective principle was limited by the Superintendents and General Superintendents set over "Presbyteries" and "Synods." not to speak of the Minister of Ecclesiastical Affairs who controlled the Supreme Ecclesiastical Council (Oberkirchenrat). The structure was obviously designed on the old Prussian model. with modern improvements ostentatiously added-to convey an impression that the architect was moving with the times. There was certainly an improvement in efficiency and the material condition of the clergy was at last improved.25

The Emperor William II intervened again and again in church affairs. In his speech to the German princes at Wittenberg, at the inauguration of bronze doors to commemorate Luther's Theses, he boldly announced himself the champion of orthodoxy (October 31, 1892). The sovereign having spoken, the Prussian Oberkirchenrat took action against Professor Harnack, who had recently stated in the Christliche Welt that the Virgin Birth need not be accepted literally. The Council deplored these views, but was hardly able to submit them in time-honoured style to the German universities, since the orthodox were in a minority in the divinity faculties. The state used pressure to insist on the compulsory use of the Apostles' Creed in the new Prussian liturgy. The attack on Harnack widened into a campaign against all liberal theologians; two vigilant orthodox professors were appointed at Marburg and Bonn

²⁵ For ecclesiastical and economic-social issues since 1870, see G. Goyau, L'Allemagne religieuse: le Protestantisme (Paris, 1896). In 1810 Protestant and Catholic endowments in Prussia were confiscated, only the latter getting adequate compensation. By 1910 the minimum Protestant stipend was only M. 2,260 (then equivalent to about \$565 per annum). By 1911 the Prussian Church had 24 General Superintendents, 639 Superintendents, and 9,390 pastors (about one-half of the Protestant clergy in Germany).

(Strafprofessoren!). This misuse of official authority did not check modernism, but stirred up resentment at the attempt to convert the church into a Zwangsgemeinschaft, a community based upon force.

Even when a convinced monarchist and orthodox pastor, Adolf Stöcker, Court Preacher till 1890, took up social reform, William II went out of his way to interfere. When this eminent Christian Socialist wandered into the devious paths of Anti-Semitism and was generally discredited, the Kaiser was not content to leave him in the political wilderness, but attacked him in a telegram made public throughout the Reich (February 28, 1896). William II believed in paternalist social legislation, but for the church or any of its members to advance its own programme it was "revolution" (Umsturz); the duty of Christians was to accept without criticism the official view of theological and political orthodoxy. "William II exercised his office as summus episcopus more freely than most of his predecessors."

II. RESULTS OF THE TERRITORIAL SYSTEM

Luther, in a pessimistic mood, remarked that "whereas before the Reformation the devil had injected the Church into the State, now he was injecting the State into the Church." Lutheran polity was "Erastian" in carrying to a logical extreme the subordination of the church to the state. This is formulated in the classic seventeenth century statement of Gerhard: "To the magistrate has been committed by God the custody of the divine law, to which belongs not only the second table of the Decalogue . . . but also the first, regulating the public worship of God."27 Chemnitz, also an ultra-Lutheran, qualified the theory by disallowing the right of the civil power to call and install a pastor "without the will and consent of the clergy and the rest of the Church."28 This opinion, however, diverged from the norm. The prince was commonly regarded as summus episcopus by divine right, in both civil and ecclesiastical capacity. Thus Principal P. T. Forsyth considered that "Luther only succeeded in restoring the Byzantine State Church with its religious parasitism."29 Even when German princes of the seventeenth

²⁶ Encyclopaedia Britannica (11th ed.), article "Establishment."

²⁷ Johann Gerhard, Loci theologici, 1610-20.
28 Martin Chemnitz, Loci theologici, 1592.

²⁹ P. T. Forsyth, Church and Sacraments, 72.

and eighteenth centuries were convinced Pietists, there was rarely much modification of their theories of personal authority, despite Spener's plea for spiritual freedom.³⁰

The Aufklärung shifted the emphasis from divine right to political utility. Thomasius (d. 1728), following the great jurist Pufendorf, urged: "Religiones debent dirigi secundum utilitatem singularum rerum publicarum." This enlightened theory was often debased in practice by princes who interpreted the common good in terms of their own interests. They employed the clergy as their "black police." As late as the early nineteenth century Frederick William III imposed the following oath on the Prussian clergy: "With life and blood, with doctrine and example, with words and deeds, I will defend the royal power and dignity as it is established . . . I will make it known in good time if I discover anything aiming at its alteration . . . and will admonish my parishioners."

Various improved versions of the territorial theory were propounded. The most sensible adaptation was devised by Dr. Mathäus Pfaff of Tübingen (1686-1760). His "collegial system," sketched in *De Originia Juris Ecclesiastici* (1719), was an attempt to safeguard the spiritual rights of the church without destroying the establishment basis of the *Landeskirche*. (1) Certain rights were reserved for the sovereign, dealing mainly with finance and property (*jus circum sacra*); (2) all other rights (doctrine, worship, installation, and discipline of clergy) belonged to the community of church members, who might delegate their authority to representative synods (*jus in sacra*).

We have already noted the grafting of a few synodical shoots on to the tree of territorialism in the nineteenth century. These modifications did not change the essence of the existing system. The theory of "dyarchy" did not work any more smoothly in ecclesiastical Germany than in political India. As late as 1893 William II claimed the right to revise the Prussian liturgy in spite of the spirited protests of eminent liturgiologists, Spitta and Smend. This was obviously a *jus in sacra*, a spiritual privilege, and not a *jus circum sacra*, affecting the church's material organization. Sehling, writing in the twentienth century, made it clear that the crass territorialism of the

³⁰ K. S. Pinson, *Pictusm as a Factor in the Rise of German Nationalism* (New York, 1934). This work brings into relief neglected aspects up to Schleiermacher's era. A fresh interpretation, with full bibliography.

past was not dead. Whatever theorists thought of "reserved" and "delegated" powers, the prince was the absolute ruler of the church. He was more than "its most illustrious member." He could issue ordinances, arrange visitations, enforce discipline, and decide appeals. The whole apparatus of territorialism disappeared in 1918, 31 but into a "room swept and garnished" by the Weimar Republic came Hitler's Reichsbischof "with seven devils worse than the first." Centuries of ecclesiastical servitude had prepared the church for incorporation in the totalitarian state.32

There is not space to do justice to the social effects of the territorial system in conjunction with Lutheran doctrine. It is understating it to say that Erastianism voked to intensive orthodoxy had little influence in ameliorating social injustice, "rugged individualism" in business, and lack of humanity in the treatment of Jews, heretics, and criminals.33 Only fear of "the powers that be" imposed restraint. "I recommend to my children submission to authority," said that zealous Lutheran Bartolomew Sastrow, "no matter whether Pilate or Caiaphas governs."34 The social gospel, directed by men like Wichern in the nineteenth century, 35 came too late. Inter-state organizations, aiming at bridging the gulf between the church and the people, were hindered by the conservative "particularism" of the separate Landeskirchen.36

³¹ Its final achievement was frenzied academic and clerical support for the German war effort, 1914-18, analyzed in a documented survey by a Danish theological professor, an admirer of true German culture; J. R. Bang, Hurrah and Hallelujah (London, 1915 and 1917).

^{32 &}quot;Territorialism" and militarism had a curious way of absorbing other movements. The "Christian Patriotism" of the Napoleonic wars, the Youth movement (Burschenschaft) that followed, and pantheism prepared the way for visionary imperialism after 1870, viewing the church as a means to state ends. Professor de Lagarde of Göttingen looked for a German Church that would not only surmount confessional differences, but also find room for vital elements in Ger-

man paganism (see R. Will, Le Culte, III, 338f).

33 Allowing for the exaggeration of an Ultramontane, there is much in Janssen's charge that territorialism, linked to the doctrine of justification by faith alone, made Lutheran'sm sterile in social ethics and philanthropy (History of the German People, XVI).

³¹ H. A. L. Fisher, ed., Social Germany in Luther's Time: Memoirs of B. Sastrow (London, 1902).

³⁵ F. G. Peabody, Jesus Christ and the Social Question (New York, 1907), is rich in references to the German literature on the subject. It is significant that Württemberg, where the church possessed more autonomy than elsewhere, produced one of the most sensible "Utopias" ever written, J. V. Andreae, Christian-opolis (1619, English translation by F. E. Held, New York, 1916).

36 e. g., the Gustavus Adolphus Union (1832), the Eisenach Conference (1852,

semi-official), the Protestantverein (1863), aiming at self-government within the church.

Is there anything to be said for the territorial system judged by its effects? Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy has pointed out that the institution of numerous Landeskirchen by princely "High Magistrates" gave the universities an authority and influence unknown abroad.³⁷ The professor's chair (Katheder) became heir to much that was derived from the bishop's chair (Cathedra). The "territorial" churches were not "established" in the Anglican sense, because they were based on a foundation broader and larger than the principality in which they were set. For instance, the Elector of Saxony acknowledged the sovereign claim of the Wittenberg Faculty of Theology to settle religious questions, which could be referred, if necessary, to the opinion of other German universities. "Princes are God's hangmen and jailors," said Luther, inferring that they had no standing in the higher sphere of Christian belief. The co-partnership of "sovereign state and sovereign seat of learning" was not so smoothworking as Rosenstock-Huessy suggests. The seventeenth century universities were the preserve of Protestant scholasticism, typified by "Professors of Controversy." But Marburg, Helmstadt, and Tübingen maintained the more liberal attitude of Melanchthon. Halle, the Pietist foundation (1694), where Frederick I ordered all intending Prussian pastors to study for two years, had become a centre of Illuminism (with a practical bent) by the middle of the eighteenth century. Göttingen (1737) was cultural and humanistic. One of its founders, the church historian Mosheim, was instrumental in securing its freedom from state control. Its Professor of Law, Dr. Schlözer, was so outstanding as a progressive Christian that he was known as "the European Conscience." Kant's appointment to the chair of metaphysics at Königsberg (1770) shed lustre on a remote university (the Prussian government even undertook the support of students who flocked thither); philosophy and Christian doctrine rubbed shoulders. Since the Aufklärung, Germany enjoyed an academic freedom not attained in England, Scotland, or America till well on in the nineteenth century. 38 Professors were highly respected, for they were publicly charged with Wissen und Gewissen. Foreigners so different as Comenius and Cairns have laid the foundation of their scholarship in German universities. Only oc-

³⁷ Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy, Out of Revolution (London, 1938).

³⁸ P. Schaff, Germany: its Universities, Theology and Religion (Edinburgh, 1857).

casionally has the state interfered with academic freedom, e. g., in the case of Semler, the pioneer rationalist (1788). In 1889, Harnack was appointed to a divinity chair in Berlin by the Minister of Public Instruction despite the emphatic protest of the Empress. His feud with William II over the Creed did not prevent him from being appointed president of all the Institutes of Research established at Berlin-Dahlem in 1900. "For the last time a theologian had played a central rôle in the interplay of government, universities, public opinion, and progress in Germany."

The German pastor has not had the independent position of the Church of England rector, secured through tithes and "the parson's freehold"; although appointed (for the most part) by a lay patron, he has had a much lower social status than the English clergyman. 39 As a fourth-class salaried official he has been regarded, by some sections of the community, as one of "the black police"; the growth of Social Democracy naturally increased anti-clericalism. Dr. Hunt, the English church historian, who was special correspondent of The Times in Berlin in 1869, gave some striking examples of the way in which pastors bullied their parishioners—manners suggesting the sixteenth rather than the twentieth century. 40 "Christian Socialism," in spite of such able and eloquent advocates as Friedrich Naumann. has been less fitted to take root in Germany than in England. owing to the gulf between pastors and people. Yet the absence of social pretensions among the German clergy, as compared to the English, should have brought the minister of religion nearer to his flock. Since the eighteenth century at least, the parishes of Protestant Germany have been staffed by a set of men who have all had the advantage of a university education. as compared to many Anglican clergy who have been put through a sketchy course in a theological college. It is to the credit of the territorial system that it has not encouraged exclusive theories of the Christian ministry. The polemical spirit of orthodox Lutheranism (which Pusey called "Orthodoxism") stopped short of claiming "apostolic succession." Certain kings of Prussia have envied England her stately hierarchy and certain "High Church" groups after 1919 would like to have restored diocesan episcopacy; but the vast majority of Lutherans are not prepared to un-church other denominations by importing

³⁹ P. Drews, Der evangelische Geistliche in der deutschen Vergangenheit (Jena, 1924).

⁴⁰ Hunt, Religious Thought in Germany (London, 1870).

over-rigid theories of the holy ministry that would cut across Luther's principle of the priesthood of all believers. 41

The territorial system has not been responsible for the social cleavage known in England as "Church and Chapel." The religious divisions of Germany have been primarily a matter of belief and historical geography. One-third of the nation is Catholic, mostly in the West and South, with Protestant patches here and there (since the annexation of Austria the proportion has risen to one-half). The Reformed Church, which numbers 2.930.000 in addition to the section absorbed in the Prussian United Church (with 20,000,000 nominal members), has not only had an official standing since 1648, but has acted as a brake on the Erastian chariot. 42 Since the Anabaptist separation of the sixteenth century, there has been no dissenting movement of any magnitude in Germany. The sects were largely of foreign origin-Mennonites, Irvingites, Methodists, and Baptists (the last two owing much to American stimulus). It has sometimes been objected that dissent has been more difficult in Germany than in England, changing the "Confession" into which one is born being a serious step, involving a declaration before a magistrate. 43 That does not seem a barrier strong enough to stem dissent with the intensity of English Nonconformity. The absence of Protestant dissent as a powerful rival to the Landeskirchen has had unfortunate effects, for healthy competition from without can stir a dead church to activity.44 There is this compensation, however. Pietist circles, instead of separating like the Moravians, have satisfied their religious needs by following Spener's precedent of acting as an evangelical leaven within the official churches—ecclesiolae in ecclesia. German separatists have generally been of the rigid, Puritanical "sect-type,"

⁴¹ Heiler's essay "The Catholic Movement in German Lutheranism" (Northern Catholicism (ed. Williams and Harris, London, 1933); H. Hermelink, Katholicismus und Protestantismus (1926).

⁴² The Reformerte Bund (1884) was founded to advance Reformed ideals; cf. Niesel, Was heisst reformert? Sasse, Was heisst lutherisch? (2nd ed., Munich, 1936), is strongly confessional, opposed to union with the Reformed Church.

⁴³ In 1905 12,000 Prussian Protestants renounced the church. Nominal membership is, however, still considerable (as in the national churches of Scotland and England). In spite of the secular spirit of the Weimar Republic and the anti-Christian tendency of the Nazi State, only 8,883,738 persons registered "no profession" out of 69,622,483 (cf. France, 29,592,784 out of 41,907,056).

⁴⁴ In 18th century Württemberg, Bengel, with the support of the Consistory, dissuaded the Grand Duke from making it illegal for Protestants to separate from the Lutheran establishment. The Landeskirche there has been far more vigorous than in states like Saxony and Mecklenburg, where dissent has been severely restricted.

tending to quietism rather than the robust political liberalism of English Nonconformity. Lutherans have made many mistakes in too ready acceptance of political Conservatism, but like Anglicans, have had the wisdom to maintain a broad attitude to life, viewing the church as a hospitable and inclusive home of the soul.

During the middle of the nineteenth century Baron Bunsen voiced the conviction that any repression of dissent by a Protestant state involved "an inner contradiction." Further, Protestantism had never developed in a true sense where full civil and religious liberty was not assured within the national church.45 Bunsen, for all his English sympathies, realized that territorialism had this advantage: the very fact that Germany was broken up into different states made it impossible to impose a uniform liturgy as a voke. In the second place, this secured an ampler liberty of thought and variety of expression than would have been possible had there been one Evangelical Church of Germany. Although the strongest supporters of territorialism have been political conservatives, Germany has not been without progressive thinkers who have seen the value of the connection between church and state. Among the theologians, Richard Rothe (1790-1867), like Dean Stanley, saw attractive possibilities in maintaining a national church, since individualism would inevitably yield to collectivism, and men would crave spiritual as well as economic satisfaction in organic co-operation. Rothe. influenced by Hegel, carried this conception rather far, for in our own times Nazi ideas of "integration" have materialized.46 This may be traced to a fundamental error, the inclination to think of the church as a human institution rather than as the body of Christ. German Lutheranism has never had the "church consciousness" which centuries of English Erastianism failed to kill, and which sprung into activity at the Oxford Movement.

Admitting the dead hand of bureaucracy in the territorialism and its failure to give the layman a healthy share in church life, we can scarcely blame the system itself for lack of breadth

⁴⁵ At present German dissent amounts to no more than .44% of the total population.

The only sect to canalise both political and religious discontent (since the Anabaptist) seems to have been Ulich's Lichtfreunde who multiplied in the years before the Revolution of 1848.

⁴⁶ Encyclopaedia Britannica (11th ed.), art. "Rothe." We can understand his stress on unification when we remember Weinel's remark, "There are more churches than states in Germany"; even when the number of states was reduced to twenty-two in 1919, there still remained twenty-eight churches.

and vision,⁴⁷ or for the narrow orthodoxy that has marred many pages of German church history. In the United States, we find powerful Lutheran bodies of German extraction. These enjoy full rights of self-government without any interference from the state, and their polity is semi-Presbyterian. But this representative church government is consistent with a confessional orthodoxy far stiffer than has been universally prevalent in Germany for many years.⁴⁸ There is evidently a dogmatic element in Lutheranism that is exaggerated rather than lessened by self-government, and becomes more pronounced when transplanted far from the humanizing modifications of European culture.

Making generous allowance for the better side of territorialism, it cannot be claimed as a form of church government that makes for spiritual maturity. "Kings shall be thy nursing fathers"49: too literal an application of this principle has produced a race of church children who never grow up. Professor Schaff complained in 1857 that in North Germany, where Lutheranism was strongest, the congregations were "almost as passive, dependent, and incapable of self-government. as in the Roman Catholic Church." If sectarianism has made the church too much of a jealously walled vineyard, territorialism has exceeded the order to cast the net into the deep—fish clean and unclean have been treated indiscriminately. Baptism and confirmation have lost their holiness by being lowered to the status of civil obligations. The church has been so secularized that the way was well prepared for Nazi usurpation, only about 10% refusing to bow the knee to Baal. In the past reforms have failed because they have come from the top rather than from below. "A coarse Byzantinism" has prevailed." The German princes claimed not merely to be "Head of the Church" like the English kings or "nutricius" (nourisher) of the church. like the Swedish kings. They asserted their right to the title of summus episcopus. Strange bishops, indeed, who never studied

47 Between the seventeenth and twentieth centuries, German Lutherans were pioneers in foreign missions, in spite of the coldness of the official churches.

⁴⁸ Particularly such offshoots as the Missouri Synod. See A. R. Wentz. The Lutheran Church in American History (Philadelphia, 1933). Lutherans in America achieved a free, synodical constitution, thus completing development arrested in Germany. Lord Acton's generalisation that "Lutheranism required to be sustained by the civil power" therefore is not true as a final judgment (J. T. McNeill, Unitive Protestantism [New York, 1930], 124-27).

theology, who were never ordained to the ministry of the Word and sacraments, and yet claimed to regulate the religion of their subjects, to fill the highest ecclesiastical offices, and to control the standards of doctrine and worship! Still more strange is this when the *summus episcopus* was a Roman Catholic like the later kings of Saxony and Bavaria, or a notorious adulterer like William I of Württemberg, or a professed sceptic like Frederick the Great, or a war-lord like the Emperor William II!⁵⁰ Not by such "nursing fathers" can the church be guided into the spiritual maturity of a divine society whose members constitute the body of Christ.

50 An eminent refugee pastor has claimed that Germany knew no "state church" till the Nazi regime; he prefers to speak of a "royal church," dependent on a "Christian ruler," and argues that the advent of neutral or hostile rulers after 1918 "disestablished the churches almost automatically." In the light of our present study, it is obvious that many a "godly prince" manipulated the church to his advantage despite a lofty profession of Christian principle. H. H. Kramm, "Organisation . . . of German Protestant Churches" (Church Quarterly Review, 1944, No. 275).

BOOK REVIEWS

TRADITIO: STUDIES IN ANCIENT AND MEDIEVAL HISTORY, THOUGHT AND RELIGION

By Johannes Questen and Stephan Kuttner, eds. Vol. I. New York: Cosmopolitan Science and Art Service Company, 1943. 418 pages. \$6.50.

This first number of a new literary venture is intended to provide room for publications which are too bulky for monthly or quarterly magazines but not suitable for monographs. The program is rather extensive: history, thought and religion of classical and Christian antiquity. contributors are men who have established a reputation for scholarship in the various departments they are cultivating. One study is written in French and another in German. Three contributions treat of the East: Oriental influence on the Gallican Liturgy, the oldest Latin version of the Byzantine liturgies and medieval Georgian historical literature. Special points are discussed in the studies on the concept of living stone in classical and Christian antiquity, on St. Irenaeus "gnosis alethes," on Ockhar's "notitia of Non-existents," on the source of Capgrave's Life of St. Augustine. Broader subjects are treated in the studies on Nominalism in the theological works of the twelfth century, on the glossators of canon law, and the rise of political representation from 1150 to 1325. A short note on the observance of the Feast of Purification in the East brings out the fact that as late as 602 A.D. Christmas had not vet been celebrated at Constantinople. Post's study on Plena Potestas (p. 355-408) points out that by the end of the thirteenth century the representatives summoned to Parliament by carrying "full power" made absolutism impossible. Kuttner tackles in his study on the glossatores of canon law one of the most intricate problem of medieval research. Boehner clears Ockham of the charge of skepticism. On the whole the studies present new results or point out new problems. This first volume of *Traditio* fully represents what it promised to be, "an effort toward comprehensive knowledge of all the living forces in the Church and secular Society." Pittsburgh, Pa. J. M. Lenhart, O. M. Cap.

A CISTERCIAN NUNNERY IN MEDIAEVAL ITALY

By CATHERINE E. BOYD. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1943. 189 pages. \$2.00.

Miss Boyd describes in this book the vicissitudes through which the little Cistercian nunnery of Rifreddo in the valley of the Po passed from its foundation in 1220 to the year 1300. Founded by Agnes of the house of the Marquis of Saluzzo, the nunnery owed its establishment and endowments to

the house of Saluzzo. About 1248 the nunnery was entrusted to the Cistercian Order to insure greater protection and economical supervision. The monks introduced enclosure in the nunnery which debarred the nuns from making a livelihood by agriculture. Their economic self-sufficiency rested on endowments and the number of their members rested on the amount of their revenues. The nunnery with its two dependent villages and one grange, with its scattered farms and tithes, resembled a corporation having in its service seventy families of tenants with one or more The money payments of the tenants were ridiculously small. The rents of their lands were mostly paid in kind and the surplus, especially cattle, was sold in the market. The income from the tithes amounted to one-fifth to one-fourth of the total income. The number of nuns supported by these revenues amounted to twenty to twenty-four. Enclosure necessitated the employment of lay-brothers and lay-sisters to transact the business outside the convent walls. Thus we find six nuns living on the grange. Litigations about their tithes brought the nuns in collision with the neighboring priests, the Cistercian monks, and even with the papal officials, so that more than once the nuns were excommunicated. The numbery was essentially an aristocratic institution, the inmates being recruited from the marchional house of Saluzzo and its related families. The book of Miss Boyd, owing to the nature of the sources, describes the economic and social conditions. It is a masterpiece of scholarship perfect in every regard. It cannot be recommended too highly to the librarians of the nunneries of this country as a model and an inspiration. Pittsburgh, Pa. I. M. Lenhart, O. M. Cap.

ENGLISH DOMESTIC OR HOMILETIC TRAGEDY, 1575-1642

By Henry Hitch Adams. New York: Columbia University Press, 1943. x, 228 pages. \$2.50.

Scholars in the field of English literature are becoming increasingly interested in the religious aspects of Elizabethan popular literature. Such recent books as Lily B. Campbell's Shakespeare's Tragic Heroes (1930), W. C. Curry's Shakespeare's Philosophical Patterns (1937), Willard Farnham's The Medieval Heritage of Elizabethan Tragedy (1936), Louis B. Wright's Middle-Class Culture in Elizabethan England (1935), and the present reviewer's Tamburlaine (1941), all explore the literature of the period with an eye to its moral ideas and philosophic premises. Under a typically Elizabethan title-page, Mr. Adams now brings us a neglected aspect of the scene: a survey of all examples up to 1642 of what he calls "domestic tragedy," pointing out the pervasive homiletical character of this genre and commenting on the more conspicuous theological passages.

Mr Adams defines "domestic tragedy" as including all plays in which the protagonist is of lowly social station—in contravention of Aristotle's canon—and in which the action turns on everyday problems of family relationships rather than on large matters of state. Introductory chapters on "Popular Theology" and "Nondramatic Literature" show how this perspective rose to dominate the didactic literature of the times. Popular preaching, by insisting that God would take care of punishing wicked rulers while the citizen's proper concern should be the salvation of his own soul, encouraged a moralizing aimed at the "common man." The doctrine of divine punishment for sin was secularized so as to place retribution in this world; and the doctrine of repentance was interpreted in Puritan terms as a last-ditch change of heart entitling the sinner to the promise of salvation in heaven but no escape in this world from the "wages of sin," physical death. Such is the theological outlook set forth in a long list of plays from W. Wager's Enough Is as Good as a Feast (c. 1580) to John Ford's 'Tis a Pity She's a Whore (c. 1627). They present, as Mr. Adams says, "a God far more interested in administering laws of heavenly justice than in the fate of an individual." At the same time, in their eagerness to avoid making sin attractive, they sacrifice psychological truth, relying on the favorite homiletical theme of a "chain of vice" to provide progress in the plot, which is then typically rounded off with a "scaffold speech" dramatizing the sinner's repentance and the already too obvious moral.

Mr. Adams' conclusion that "domestic tragedy" rises from tenets "founded on orthodox theology" (p. 189) needs qualification. On the orthodox theology of Puritanism, no doubt; but not, obviously, on the orthodoxy of Aquinas (which, as Professor Curry has shown, underlies Shakespeare's Macbeth). I would question likewise whether the term "realistic" as applied to these plays may not be misleading, since it can mean only that they have notable patches of verisimilitude as regards external details—a far different quality, certainly, from the realism of

Macbeth.

Vanderbilt University.

Roy W. Battenhouse.

JOHN DURY: ADVOCATE OF CHRISTIAN REUNION

By J. Minton Batten. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1944. 227 pages. \$2.50.

John Dury (1596-1680) dedicated his life to the cause of Christian reunion and for fifty-two years labored indefatigably to make the "Communion of the Saints" something more than an article in the various Confessions. In his own day, he found himself "rowing against the current of the times," and all his irenic efforts were unsuccessful. Today the social climate has changed and men of lesser stature are carried by "the current of the times" to a vast variety of achievements in the field of Christian unity, any one of which would have delighted the heart of the seventeenth century advocate of reunion. Like Dante, driven from his beloved Florence, becoming in later years his native city's chief claim to glory, so Dury today is reaping the fruits of a long delayed harvest.

The incessant journeying of Dury in pursuit of his cherished ideal makes his biography read very much like an itinerary journal. This fact, together with the fact that he was in reality a rather colorless personality, rules out the possibility of transforming an account of his life into a spritely narrative. Yet, Dury was one of the most important channels by which "the reformers' ideas of the desirability of a united Protestantism" were transmitted to the contemporary churches. His activities, therefore,

have long deserved the adequate, scholarly, and thoroughgoing treatment which Professor Batten has now given us.

Dury might be accused of being the possessor of a one-track mind, but he did find time to join with Comenius in urging a program of educational reform; he became one of the early proponents of Protestant missionary activity; and he was deeply concerned about the plight of the Jews. During the Civil War, Dury returned to England to participate in the Westminster Assembly, and under the Protectorate he became a trusted adviser of Cromwell in the field of foreign policy. The influence of Dury's emphasis on "practical divinity" on Philip Jacob Spener might well bear further investigation.

The Divinity School, University of Chicago.

Winthrop S. Hudson.

LORD HERBERT OF CHERBURY'S DE RELIGIONE LAICI

By Harold R. Hutcheson, ed. and tr. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1944. x, 199 pages. \$3.00.

In the history of the theory of religious toleration, this is an important document. To illustrate its tone I would pick this statement, that "although there may be diversity of religions just as of animals, yet in all these matters God is wise" (p. 113). The sentiment is akin, it strikes me, to Pope's complacent "Whatever is, is right." The context, like Pope's, seems to imply a principle of "plenitude" and is accompanied by the idea that God, sole author of all things, produces nothing "save to good purpose." Also anticipatory of Pope is Herbert's scepticism of men's attempts to scan God in dogmas, in place of which he offers certain "common notions" discoverable, so he thinks, from the proper study of mankind -man. Inscribed in the understanding of all men, says Herbert, and imbedded in all historic religions, whether Christian or pagan, are five "catholic truths." Since they are "not difficult to perceive or lying in concealment," it is possible for "right reason" to bring them out by distinguishing them from "a great many inappropriate and unholy things . . . mixed with these articles." The layman's religion here recommended is unecclesiastical, unChristian, and unhistorical: it assumes an escape from religious controversy by transferring the seat of revelation from Christ to Everyman and placing authority approximately where Pope placed it in his declaration that "where instinct is th' unerring guide, What pope or council can they need beside?" (Essay on Man, III, 83-84).

But Herbert's thought not only points ahead to Pope and Shaftesbury; it also points back to a long development of natural theology by Platonists. Unfortunately, Mr. Hutcheson fails to include within the survey of his introduction either of these two ramifications of his subject. When he looks backward in search of the genesis of Herbert's "deism" he gets not much further than a vague reference to "the innumerable Italian literary academies of the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries" together with some notice of Castellion and Acontius as regards their attacks on the doctrine of exclusive salvation. He makes the mistake of understanding early deism wholly as a protest against religious

persecution. Thus he fails to take into account what Professor Lyttle pointed out in this journal several years ago, that Herbert's deism is more properly "ethical theism," having important affinities with the thought of Bodin, Charron, and Gemisthos Pletho—to which list I would add also the names of Pico della Mirandola, Conrad Mut, and Reuchlin. "Ethical theism" is a natural growth from the challenge offered to dogmatic faith by Platonic moral philosophy as revived by Pletho: Herbert's treatise is but a neat compendium of the key conclusions— which eighteenth century deism occasionally exaggerates into open infidelity.

The weakness of Hutcheson's introduction probably stems from the fact (apparent, I think) that he himself inclines to be satisfied with Herbert's teaching. He dismisses far too quickly the traditional objections to Herbert's thought (pp. 41-42), and later remarks seriously that "it takes no casuistry to find in Herbert's emphasis on the five articles a comprehension of the chief purpose of Christ's ministry" (p. 53). I'm afraid

our teaching of the Atonement-drama has lapsed sadly!

It must be said in praise of Mr. Hutcheson's edition, however, that his excellence as a bibliographer largely compensates for his shortcomings as a theologian. The bibliography he has furnished lists all editions of Herbert's printed works, some fifty-nine items described with nicest skill, many of them from copies held in Hutcheson's private collection. It is interesting that the *De Religione Laici* has had heretofore only two editions, in 1645 and 1656. From such neglect it is now rescued in an accurate and handsome text, felicitously translated on pages facing the Latin.

Vanderbilt University.

Roy W. Battenhouse.

CARMELITE AND POET

A FRAMED PORTRAIT OF ST. JOHN OF THE CROSS

By ROBERT SENCOURT. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1944. xvi, 278 pages. \$3.00.

A varied galaxy of writers have contributed in recent years to the study of St, John of the Cross. The scholarly work of a modern Spanish Carmelite, Fr. Crisogono, has been built on by clerics and others of his own church, by an Anglican religious, Dom Bede Frost, by an Anglican layman who is also unrivalled as a Hispanic scholar, E. A. Peers, and by such a detached observer as Aldous Huxley. One naturally asks, therefore, of a new writer in this field what is his viewpoint and what his special contribution. Mr. Sencourt writes as a Catholic layman with the interests of a historian and a literary critic. His orthodoxy is guaranteed by a preface by R. H. J. Steuart, S. J. and (in the American edition) the *Imprimatur* of the Archbishop of New York; his scholarly honesty and literary and spiritual insight appear sufficiently in his work. Its merits may best be estimated by a comparison with Professor Peers' recent *Spirit of Flame*, a similar work on St. John in his context. Peers moves more surely in the Spanish background, Sencourt in the ecclesiastical. Peers' translations of St. John's mystical love-poems are both

more accurate and more suggestive of the spirit of the original; but Sencourt's appreciations and parallels from English literature add much. He claims Wordsworth's attitude of receptivity to God in nature as a close parallel to St. John's receptivity before God—the question here is not about St. John but about Wordsworth, and it is refreshing to find so direct a challenge to his modern detractors. Peers gives the facts of St. John's external career more clearly; Sencourt presents them as they appeared to him, unavoidable interruptions to the life of prayer. is probably the better introducer; Sencourt raises without precisely answering the questions that come next. For St. John of the Cross is by no means a simple character, less so than St. Teresa, which may be why his fame has always been to hers as moon to sun. He was theologian of sound scholastic training, poet of vivid imagery, modern man with real sympathy with his age (cf. his interest in the psychology of religion) vet with all this the austere mystic whose motto was to leave all in order to find All. How were these combined? The answer is not to be found in books about the mystics; and so our present author raises the important questions, shows how aimless is most learned chatter about mysticism (St. John anticipated much of it, anyway), and leaves the reader who would go further face-to-face with the mystical Doctor of the Church himself.

General Theological Seminary.

E. R. Hardy, Jr.

AUSTRIAN AID TO AMERICAN CATHOLICS, 1830-1860

By Benjamin J. Blied. Milwaukee: Sold by author, 1944. 205 pages. \$2.50.

The professor of European History and Languages at St. Francis' Seminary, with the usual Catholic approval and permission, tells the story of the influence of Austrian Catholic money and persons upon the development of Catholicism in the United States during the eventful decades, 1830 to 1860. It is mainly a summary of the work of the Leopoldine Society on the advancing American frontier.

Loosely constructed and leaving the reader wondering with such listings as "Sealsfield, Charles, All his Works" and "United States Government Publications, sundry volumes," the study nevertheless contains many glimpses of goings-on within American life of the early nineteenth century. Lyman Beecher and inventor Morse record their suspicions, Austrian apocalyptist, Bernard Smolnikar, denounces the bishops and the pope and forbids the use of the "Hail Mary" and the Sign of the Cross, Jesuits often preach in Protestant churches, the German Catholics and their Irish brethren are at odds, orphanages and hospitals are built, "while a person converts sixty Indians, six hundred Germans lose the faith because they have no priest," the most Holy Redeemer Church of New York City is the "unofficial mother church of Germans in America."

The most interesting chapter to the outsider is "III. Austrians and Americans write about each other."

Since the German Catholics, unlike the Irish Catholics, regarded

schools as next in significance to the church, attention focuses on parochial schools. The first such parish school in New England was organized in Boston, 1844. On the frontier many Protestant children were in Catholic schools and some enthusiasts shouted: "We have got the West." The School Sisters of Notre Dame and the Redemptorists were most devoted to teaching in pioneer German schools. The latter order "not only helped to eradicate trusteeism, it laid the foundations for the system of German Catholic schools which greatly influenced all Catholicism in America. When the work of teaching took on huge proportions, the Redemptorists called upon the School Sisters of Notre Dame to continue the work which they had so ably begun" (p. 160); "just when the Church was losing the battle for a share in the American public school system, these (religious) orders of women opened the schools which were the foundations of the American Catholic system of education" (p. 183).

University of Rochester.

Conrad Henry Moehlman.

A SHORT LIFE OF KIERKEGAARD

By Walter Lowrie. Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1942. 271 pages. \$2.75.

By publishing this book, Dr. Lowrie has added another merit to the treasury of merits that he has earned in making Kierkegaard known to American and English readers. This short biography, which is an independent work and not an abbreviation of the larger study which he published in 1938, will serve admirably in introducing what I hope will be a wide circle of readers to the personality of Kierkegaard and to his works. Dr. Lowrie deserves to be commended for having made skillful use of Kierkegaard's self-analyses, instead of relying upon the more or less irrelevant interpretations of the many Kierkegaard scholars. The traits which mark his earlier larger work are apparent also throughout this smaller volume: Dr. Lowrie writes as an enthusiastic lover of Kierkegaard and he is not primarily interested in offering a balanced interpretation and judgment of the life and work of his hero. He expects to lead his readers to a perusal of Kierkegaard's writings.

It may be asked, however, whether the students of Kierkegaard, to whom Dr. Lowrie addresses himself, do not require a more specific philosophical and theological introduction to his ideas. The English or American biography of Kierkegaard which interprets his whole work in a way similar to that of Emanuel Hirsch, Kierkegaard's most competent

German biographer, still remains to be written.

The University of Chicago.

Wilhelm Pauck.

THE EPISCOPAL THEOLOGICAL SCHOOL, 1867-1943

By James Arthur Muller. Cambridge: The Episcopal Theological School, 1943. 246 pages.

Cambridge Seminary is now an honored institution of the Episcopal Church, but for many years after its foundation it was the center of bitter controversy. It was established in 1867 at a time when party feeling among Episcopalians was higher than it has ever been before or since. The church's oldest seminary, General, long under High Church control, was then dominated by the Anglo-Catholics, and it was hoped that Cambridge, whose founders were all conservative Evangelicals, would help to counteract this influence.

It did, but at the same time it developed tendencies of its own which seemed even more alarming to many. Its two most influential professors, Peter Henry Steenstra and Alexander V. G. Allen, of whom Professor Muller says that their teaching was "what really made the school for the first forty years of its life," were liberals of a sort then considered very advanced. Steenstra was especially frightening, for he was introducing into America the technique of higher criticism, against which the House of Bisl-ops in 1865 had issued a special pastoral letter, written by a prominent Evangelical bishop, and against which it was again to fulminate as late as 1894.

Professor Muller does full justice to this exciting period, but he does not make the mistake of giving it disproportionate emphasis in the history of a seminary whose greatest achievement was not the defense of certain disputed theological opinions, important though they were, but the maintenance of a remarkably high level of scholarship at a time when the standards of theological education generally were very low. Writing, as a school historian should, with affection but without idolatry, he gives a full account of the vicissitudes and achievements of his institution, enlivening his narrative with numerous personal details which, while their chief appeal will no doubt be to the alumni and friends of the school, are not without interest to anyone who cares to study human nature as it manifests itself in a small academic community. His book is an excellent example of a difficult type of monograph.

New York City.

William W. Manross.

LEADERS OF THE CANADIAN CHURCH

By Bertal Henney. Third Series. Toronto: The Ryerson Press, 1943. 191 pages. \$3.00.

Canon Henney has edited brief biographical sketches of some of the

leaders of the Church of England in Canada.

The life stories are used as a medium through which to present some of the main historical developments of Canadian Anglicanism. The biographies cover stirring passages in Canada's history, the push of population westward, the early twentieth century rush of immigration, the first World War, the period of reconstruction which followed. It is in this setting that the writers have shown the Church growing and adapting itself. Expansion and missionary activity are made vivid in the stories of Archbishop Mountain, Bishops Anderson, Machray, Thorneloe and Stringer, and of William Duncan. The diffusion of the Church across the dominion brought problems of consolidation and unification. Among others, the Reverends Norman Tucher and Sydney Gould saw the vision

and, through the Canadian Missionary Society, strove to realize it as did Archbishop Williams in the development of a Book of Common Praise and a Canadian Book of Common Prayer. Although every recognition is given to the Canadian Church's debt to the British Church, yet the necessity of the movement to attain self-government and self-support for the Canadian branch of the Church is clearly demonstrated. Growth in organization was accompanied by development in thought, and the writer shows in his account of Frederick Julius Steen that conservative forces won only a temporary triumph. The personality of each leader emerges vividly as it is depicted in its influence on the course of the Church's history.

The books seems to lean a little heavily to the side of organizational history, but it would repay anyone who is interested in the Church's development and possibilities. It would be interesting to see a similar treatment of the story of the missionaries and parish clergymen as they faced the challenge of those years.

Chicago, Illinois.

Norah L. Hughes.

THE HISTORIOGRAPHY OF THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC CHURCH: 1785-1943

By JOHN PAUL CADDEN. Washington, D. C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1944. xi, 122 pages.

This well arranged and attractively printed bibliographical study is published as a doctor's dissertation at the Catholic University of America, and is Part I of a larger project which is to include The Literature of American Catholic Church History as Part II, and a Selected Catalogue of the Literature of American Catholic History as Part III. Under the inspiration and direction of Monsignor Peter Guilday and Professor Richard J. Purcell, the latter Chairman of the Department of History and the former Professor of American Church History at the Catholic University, many special studies in American Catholic history have been making their appearance in a steady flow these last twenty years. Under the direction of Father Guilday thirty-three doctor's dissertations on American Catholic historical subjects have appeared since 1922, while more than twenty have appeared sponsored by Professor Purcell. This is a most astonishing record and is evidence of the growing interest of American Catholics in their history.

Of the five chapters in the present study three are devoted to straight historiography for given periods; Chapter II is a laudatory account of the father of American Catholic history, John Gilmary Shea, while Chapter III discusses Catholic Historical Societies and their publications. Since the turn of the century, Catholic Historical Societies have sprung up in the various sections of the country where Catholics are particularly numerous and aggressive and many of the state societies have begun publications. The American Catholic University at Washington has been and remains the principal center for research in American

Catholicism, though St. Louis and Fordham have also in more recent

years produced some worthy studies.

As one interested primarily in the total impact of religion on American life. I have tried to direct my students both in their reading and research to a more comprehensive approach than have my Catholic coworkers. Professor Purcell, whose volume, Connecticut in Transition, won the Justin Winsor Prize in 1916, is both well equipped in training and temper to direct Catholic students to a wider understanding of all the religious forces that have been present in American life.

The University of Chicago.

William Warren Sweet.

THE LEGACY OF THE LIBERAL SPIRIT

By Fred G. Bratton. New York: Charles Scribners' Sons, 1943. x, 319 pages. \$2.75.

Regarding "liberal," definition is necessary. The author defines: "The word 'liberal' as herein used refers to a way of life which emphasizes the primary importance of the person, the freedom of the individual, free press, free speech, constitutional government, tolerance, the scientific spirit of inquiry, the national outlook, social reform, popular education. a relativist philosophy, and an ethico-social religion." But the emphasis of his book is not what would be expected from this statement of the preface. It is concerned chiefly with a well-marked kind of religious thinking which is constant in and along the history of Christianity. "Seven ages of liberal thought" are described: "early Christian radicalism," "the Renaissance-Reformation," with weight on the Renaissance, eighteenth century rationalism, "American Deism," "New England Unitarianism," "The Nineteenth Century Age of Criticism," "Twentieth Century Naturalism." The method is largely biographical; there are chapters on Origen, Erasmus, Voltaire, Paine, Theodore Parker, Darwin, John Dewey, and besides many sketches of persons, Clement, Leonardo da Vinci, the Sozzinis, Franklin, Jefferson, Emerson, Thoreau, Channing.

What Dr. Bratton considers true religion and good theology might be inferred from his table of contents, but he makes it clear. "The Socinians shared with all humanists . . . the belief that man was of infinite worth and would achieve his own salvation through character. They saw no reason for the atonement and disbelieved in Jesus as deity." "The eighteenth century philosophers . . . were . . . certain that reason and knowledge would insure a better society in the future. This progress would issue not from God's grace but from man's intelligence." "The unorthodox statements of Tom Paine are today the considered opinions of most informed people." The result of nineteenth century criticism was that "The Bible . . . was not a supernatural revelation . . . but a human document, recording one people's search for reality." Dr. Bratton's slogan, so to speak, oft repeated, is "human perfectability." The present outcome of religious thought is two schools, "Neo-Supernaturalism"—"the semi-Barthians talk much of total depravity and divine grace"—which "betrays the best thought of the last four hundred years," and "Naturalistic Hu-

manism," "a faith in the supreme value and self-perfectability of human

personality.'

All this is superfluously familiar. So much has been quoted to avoid injustice to Dr. Bratton. It goes without saying that human liberty and social welfare have been greatly advanced by the men and movements described by him, which have been largely at variance with orthodox Christianity; also that the Christian orthodoxy which he so indefatigably berates has far too often been a reactionary intellectual and social force, In support of both these positions there is a great deal to say. It is salutary to have it forcibly said, as it is by Dr. Bratton. But his book would leave on people uninformed about the history of Christianitty the impression, which indeed it appears designed to leave, that during the Christian era the principal agency for advancing human liberty and social welfare has been the humanistic and rationalistic religion here illustrated. A vast amount of relevant facts is omitted. For example Dr. Bratton does not refer, except for the presence of Penn's name in a quotation, to the Quakers, who have done something for human good. He does not mention the momentous influence of Calvinism for political liberty. He never speaks of the strongest force for social reform of modern times, the evangelical revival of the eighteenth century. Many other instances might be cited of the effect of the orthodox Christianity which he disdains for the liberal ends which he thinks desirable. In view of such considerations his book must stand as unhistorical and partial.

For the rest, Dr. Bratton's biographical sketches are lively and informing. His pleas for liberty and his attacks on intolerance all must praise. It is a good book for the orthodox to read. With some of its historical judgments salt must be used; these proceed from the author's partisanship, his reliance on authors like-minded, and his apparent insensibility to other forms of religious thinking than his own. "Luther," he says, "a comparatively late comer, simply rode on the tidal wave of social and political unrest which precipitated the actual break with Catholicism." This suggests that there is a world of religious life outside the author's ken.

Union Theological Seminary.

Robert Hastings Nichols.